

0001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0002
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0003
1

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2011
OFFICER'S CLUB, BUILDING 50
PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

ATTENDEES

RAB Members:
Doug Kern, Facilitator
Eileen Fanelli
Agnes Farres
Brian Ullensvang
Denise Tsuji
Angela Blanchett
Jan Blum
Gloria Gee
Julian Hultgren
Sara Segal
Toni Kramer
Sam Berman
Barbara Newton
John Chester
Edward Callanan
Connie Gazaway

---oOo---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
of the Meeting, and on October 13, 2010, 7:05 PM at the
Officer's Club, Building 50, Presidio of San Francisco,
California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527,
State of California, there commenced a RAB meeting under
the provisions of the Presidio Trust.

---oOo---

AGENDA

RAB Meeting.txt

	Page
1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
4) Reports and Discussions - Eileen Fanelli	
A. Landfill 2/10 Erosion Status Report	5
B. Landfill E Document Preview	17
C. Upcoming Document Release Schedule	42
5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
Denise Tsuji, California DTSC -	50
Agnes Farres, California RWQCB -	62
6) New Business -	65
7) Public Comment - None	
8) Action Items and Agenda Items	65
9) Adjournment	68

0004

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Let's get started.
2 Good evening, everyone. My name's Doug Kern and welcome
3 to the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board meeting for
4 January 2011. Happy new year to everyone. Thank you for
5 coming out on a cold night and for your participation in
6 the meeting. Thanks very much.
7 Are there any -- I guess before we leave
8 item number 1, we have someone new with us here tonight.
9 Denise, perhaps you can introduce her for us.
10 MS. TSUJI: Happy New Year, everyone.
11 I've brought with me Angela Blanchett and she is our
12 public participation supervisor, so she's joining us
13 tonight.
14 MS. BLANCHETT: Glad to be here. Welcome
15 to everyone and excuse my gloves. It's cold in here.
16 FACILITATOR KERN: All of the people
17 around the table except for Eileen and Connie are
18 community members of the Restoration Advisory Board.
19 MS. BLANCHETT: Glad to be here.
20 FACILITATOR KERN: On item number 5,
21 looking at the agenda, it has my name next to DTSC status
22 update, so I think we'll leave that to our DTSC
23 representatives.
24 Are there any other changes to the agenda?
25 Announcements? Two of us tonight are

0005

1 having birthdays. Jan and Mark. Happy birthday to you.
2 Happy birthday. And the dedication that they have to be
3 here tonight to be at our meeting, we appreciate it very
4 much.
5 MR. BERMAN: I hope they realize that this
6 is the day with five ones that will only occur once in
7 their lifetime.
8 Seeing no other announcements, let us go on
9 to our discussions, presentations, item 4A. It's mostly
10 updates that we can talk about if you have anything for
11 us or we have comments, however you'd like to --
12 MS. FANELLI: I'm happy to get any

13 comments. I'm happy to give an update. How would you
14 like to go? Any specific questions for updates?

15 FACILITATOR KERN: I've noticed at
16 landfill 10 that there were some minor issues. I don't
17 know --

18 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: -- if you want --

20 MS. FANELLI: You probably have seen it if
21 you look at the site, particularly from 16th Avenue.
22 There's two areas that we had sort of a localized slump
23 that are now covered with plastic.

24 So you'll see the plastic, and those
25 occurred I think after the second large rain in December,

0006

1 and we have our contractor RRG who actually is as an
2 extension of their mediation staff doing regulatory or
3 pre-storm, post-storm inspections helping us with
4 maintenance. So they're helping us with our space.

5 When the failures occurred on that Saturday
6 evening that it was raining quite hard, and I forget the
7 actual day in December that that was, and they are --
8 they are mobilized. There's one -- they're both
9 approximately in the steepest portion of the slope below
10 where the overlook is.

11 When that occurred, they -- one that is
12 mid-slope, we call that one I think slide two which kind
13 of rotated out and slid basically down and it messed up
14 the fabric.

15 It didn't hurt any of the cover material
16 really beneath it, but there was a -- sort of a failure
17 of the fabric of that cover in that one area.

18 And then the other area's much closer down
19 at the bottom of the slope, and it looks a little
20 similar, but it wasn't that much.

21 So we basically went out there the next
22 Monday and assessed it and we covered the area up. We
23 installed some hay bale type dikes to help support the
24 soil so we wouldn't get any head cutting on those slides.
25 We put in some temporary drainage so we're draining those

0007

1 areas.

2 The cover soils at the site are quite wet,
3 and covered it up to protect it from any more rain. And
4 since that, we haven't seen any additional changes or
5 movement on the slope. So things have been performing
6 very well otherwise.

7 We have had the engineers come out and take
8 a look at the site. They have drafted up -- we've
9 instructed them to draft us a memorandum giving us their
10 opinion, their analysis on the mechanism for the slide.

11 That just came in and we are reviewing it.
12 It does discuss their thoughts on the mechanism. It is a
13 localized failure. It's nothing in their opinion
14 systemic in terms of the cover.

15 And then they've reviewed the measures that
16 we've implemented. I think they have recommended Moore,
17 which I don't know off the top of my head, and we'll
18 likely implement whatever their recommendations there.

19 And then the second thing that we have
20 asked them to do that they haven't done yet -- we'll talk
21 to Moore about when they go to fix it -- we believe we
22 won't go fix those two areas until the dry season, but we
23 are anticipating doing repairs to those two locations.

24 Jan.
25 MS. BLUM: How deep were these channels
0008
1 and what kind of damage occurred?
2 MS. FANELLI: It was simple soil. They're
3 relatively shallow. They don't cut all the way through.
4 They're not cutting from above. It was always if the
5 soils got extra saturated and then weren't compacted
6 enough and kind of boiled out.
7 So they're not that deep. I don't know
8 exactly how deep they are.
9 MS. BLUM: Can you just roughly guess?
10 MS. FANELLI: They vary at being
11 superficial in some areas to maybe a foot at the center.
12 MS. GAZAWAY: It's not really a channel.
13 It's kind of an eight foot wide swath that kind of slips
14 down the slope.
15 MS. FANELLI: This part sort of did this
16 and then slid down the hill. This part of the hill's all
17 right. It's just this area up here that has kind of a
18 scoop out of it because that's where the material went.
19 MS. BLUM: Is there any plant material?
20 What did this disrupt?
21 MS. FANELLI: It affected some of the
22 wattles in the fabric. We've covered that up and
23 replaced that, so that's all right.
24 The plants that were planted directly below
25 it, because we've covered it with plastic, they did

0009
1 survive or we anticipated replanting.
2 MS. GAZAWAY: Everything stayed on the
3 site. They haven't taken the habitat.
4 MS. BLUM: Everything what?
5 MS. GAZAWAY: Stayed onsite.
6 MR. BERMAN: Does this affect in any way
7 the eventual seismic stability of the slope?
8 MS. FANELLI: We don't think so. Not
9 seismic stability, just static stability. That's the
10 question that we've asked the engineers directly, and
11 that's the memo. They've given us a draft and we just
12 got it.

13 We will be issuing it both -- we'll copy
14 the Water Board and the RAP, and I'm hoping that will be
15 issued if not this week, early next week.

16 MR. BERMAN: But there weren't any
17 specific seismic upgrades to that slope as far as
18 remediation?

19 MS. FANELLI: The slope was designed to
20 provide a factor of safety assuming a seismic event on
21 the order of the 1906 earthquake. So I'm not sure how to
22 interpret what you mean improvements, but the slope angle
23 and the material and its placement are designed to
24 withstand with minimal displacement that kind of event.

25 Brian.

0010
1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Will we get a chance to
2 review this memo?

3 MS. FANELLI: I just indicated we'll be
4 issuing it to the Water Board and DTSC.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: You didn't mention the
6 Park Service.

7 MS. FANELLI: I'm sorry, yes.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: You said you might issue
Page 4

9 it next week.

10 MS. FANELLI: Our agreement with the Park
11 Service, they do get to review it. We will definitely
12 send it to you.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Thank you.

14 MS. BLUM: Just for clarification, this is
15 landfill 10 and you said it occurred near 16th Avenue.

16 So do you have a picture of this? I'm just
17 not sure on where it is.

18 MS. FANELLI: It did not occur near 16th
19 Avenue. 16th Avenue is the best vantage point to take a
20 look at the slope. It was below the overlook area.

21 So if you stand at the edge --

22 MS. BLUM: I got it.

23 MR. BERMAN: That slope was cut already,
24 right? In order to meet the seismic requirements.

25 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

0011

1 MR. BERMAN: Is there any suspicion that
2 the cutting of the slope was in fact responsible for
3 the -- for this particular driftout?

4 MS. FANELLI: No. It was really soil
5 placement, it's compaction and the fact that it was
6 saturated and wet.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: That would be my
8 concern for the rest of the cap, that if we could
9 identify something that happened in that local spot and
10 then we could recognize it maybe in other places in the
11 site, we could do something in advance.

12 MS. FANELLI: Well, that's what we've
13 specifically asked SCS to do, evaluate the mechanism with
14 their design, their calculations and make
15 recommendations.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. BERMAN: Were they the same engineers
18 that did the seismic design?

19 MS. FANELLI: Yes, they are.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess one thing that
21 occurred to me from looking at it, perhaps there's
22 difference in the material. Maybe there was a clay
23 content or something that expanded or saturated more,
24 sort of came unglued.

25 Are they looking at that sort of soils and

0012

1 all of that in there --

2 MS. FANELLI: I would presume so.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

4 MS. FANELLI: We've asked them to give us
5 their evaluation of what that mechanism, why it happened.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

7 MS. FANELLI: And the truth is I haven't
8 read it, so I can't tell you. But I would imagine
9 they're looking at how it was constructed, they reviewed
10 their compaction measurements because they had been
11 monitoring compaction throughout the construction.

12 MS. GEE: When something like that happens
13 unexpected, how does the cost enter into the project, the
14 original estimate, the workings?

15 MS. FANELLI: We have in our budgets a
16 maintenance line item, so that this would be considered
17 maintenance for us and monitoring. So the activities are
18 actually included in our budget --

19 MS. GEE: Okay.

20 MS. FANELLI: -- at this point.
21 MS. BLUM: Since the Park Service is the
22 owner of this land, should it not have been that they
23 were the primary agency on the site when this happened
24 and would work with you to direct activities?
25 MS. FANELLI: The Trust is responsible for

0013
1 ongoing O&M on the landfill in perpetuity in our
2 agreements, so we are the primary responder to what needs
3 to be repaired and repair.

4 So we have --
5 MS. BLUM: Just out of collaboration,
6 would it not be normal to include the Park Service up
7 front on something like that, though?

8 That seems to me that it would be almost
9 the first thing that would happen is that the landowner
10 would be involved in the repair or the assessment and the
11 decision-making.

12 MS. FANELLI: I suppose I would turn to
13 Brian and direct your question there.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's why I have asked
15 to have an opportunity to review the document they
16 produced. I don't know the scope of what all they've
17 asked to engineers to look at.

18 MS. BLUM: I'm going to ask my question
19 again. Maybe I'm mistaken. Wouldn't you be the first to
20 know what was going on in this area?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: We would like to be.

22 MS. BLUM: Okay.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: I -- I didn't put the
24 landfill 8 on this, but in a -- after I noticed the
25 problem and I looked over at 8, as well, there seemed to

0014
1 be some smaller issues. I don't know if you have seen
2 any of those. Just smaller cuts that didn't get too deep
3 or anything.

4 MS. FANELLI: No. There's some movement
5 of the sand. Again, it's a sand cover and it's not
6 expected to stay completely in place. It's all
7 consolidated.

8 There's been some planting, and I think
9 Terri was here last month and gave you all a heads-up on
10 the planting and the seeding. So we don't have a lot of
11 plants there at this point.

12 But we are monitoring it, and when we see
13 sand shifting that's not appropriate or safe, we do
14 activities on it.

15 There's been a little bit of maintenance on
16 it, but there hasn't been any significant movements of
17 sand.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: I noticed in that area
19 where there was that large gully, that looks like it's
20 holding it well.

21 MS. FANELLI: I would hope so, yes. That
22 was reconstructed as you know with green forest geotubes.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: I just wanted to
24 mention that as a compliment that it was holding up
25 really well.

0015
1 MS. FANELLI: It was robust repair. Thank
2 you.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Landfill 2, walking by
4 there during the rains, I noticed some settling behind

boards and some places where it had washed out from behind that.

MS. FANELLI: The terraces performed as designed. We did have -- we did observe water coming on to the site from two locations, and that focus flow did inundate the terraces and they performed as designed meaning that they filled up with water and got saturated pretty quick, and then in certain locations on the terraces, because we did have a fair amount of rains, the water found its way through and underneath and the sand from one -- some of the sand from one terrace in localized areas would be deposited below on the other terraces.

Again, most all of it was retained in the terraces, and at the very bottom terrace, there's one small area where there's some sand on the trail, and we did our inspections right after the rains and then we submitted these activities to get that filled back in and to modify, and put in some additional mulch to help filter the sand.

It does point to the fact that again

unconsolidated sand moves. So the terraces were actually critical in maintaining that Sand Hill side.

If you saw how it moved, imagine if we were not there. It would have been a lot of sand down -- downstream.

So we've observed where the flows have been, and as you know, the site's not finished being constructed. It's just been winterized.

And we don't have our channel, and it's kind of nice that we haven't finished, so we can see where we have to do a lot of tweaks to that design. It's still to be constructed.

I think that was probably the most movement we saw at either site. Fillsite 1 has been performing very well. The -- there's a fair amount of runoff if you've noticed from Julius Kahn, which is upstream of the project site, and that flow comes down now and discharges in that washing line channel adjacent to the toe. So it's performing very well in its design, as well.

FACILITATOR KERN: We've had -- a couple of our student classes have been out there at El Polin doing planting and things, so we've been around looking at all the remediation and all of that.

I've noticed that there was some settling and kind of generalized cracking behind some of the

terrace walls. You know, like the soil in large amounts was --

MS. FANELLI: Those are the areas where the sand --

MS. GAZAWAY: It kind of pipes underneath. They acted as kind of a cutoff wall.

If they hadn't been there, it would have cut all the way down. It kind of blocked it and it made the travel path a little longer.

It kind of created a sinkhole underneath those, because that's all loosely placed material for planting. So that was not a compacted area, so that's where we had that piping underneath the wall.

But it did cut as much as two feet in some locations underneath the wall. So it could have -- and

16 that was when you had a real flat slope.
 17 If it had been, you know, a complete slope
 18 at the loosely planted soil, we could have had that
 19 cutting all the way down. It was localized thankfully.
 20 MS. FANELLI: So we continue to learn our
 21 lesson about how difficult unconsolidated sand is to work
 22 with on the slopes.
 23 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, any other
 24 questions on those remedial issues? Thank you very much.
 25 Landfill E, last summer RAB meeting, we

0018

1 talked about potentially having a document release at the
 2 end of January. So this is kind of a placeholder really
 3 to just talk about the progress of where that might be,
 4 what we might expect, and I can also say that there's --
 5 I've noticed there's quite a bit of -- well, very
 6 significant amount of work being done over at Landfill E.

7 MS. FANELLI: The treatment level work I'm
 8 pleased to say has been going very well. I believe the
 9 contract will be completed this week. They did get all
 10 of the perimeter trees down by the end of calendar year.
 11 The -- it's at the end of bird nesting season.

12 Instead of a chipper, this guy, contractor
 13 has a big huge machine that shreds them. They kind of go
 14 in as whole tree trunks. Kind of interesting.

15 We actually used some of those shredded
 16 trees what we did our maintenance at Landfill 2 and
 17 fill site 1. So it's been helpful. So that work will be
 18 completed.

19 We are working on the draft F/S RAP, and
 20 our hope is to submit that draft F/S RAP to DTSC for
 21 review by the end of the month. So we are still on
 22 target for that.

23 MS. BLUM: The shredded trees primarily
 24 were eucalyptus, weren't they.

25 MS. GAZAWAY: Primarily eucalyptus trees.

0019

1 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

2 MS. BLUM: So they are or are not being
 3 used in a natural area, native sand area?

4 MS. FANELLI: No. They're being placed
 5 mainly on the trails so that people can walk on them.

6 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

7 MS. KRAMER: And were they removed because
 8 they were contaminated because they were in the way of
 9 construction?

10 MS. FANELLI: They would ultimately be in
 11 the way of the final remedy, whatever it is for Landfill
 12 E.

13 MS. KRAMER: So they weren't on
 14 necessarily growing in contaminated area.

15 MS. GAZAWAY: Almost all of them are.
 16 They're within the footprint of the landfill.

17 There's only a couple that we had to take
 18 out in the access road to get to the landfill, but
 19 everything else is within the footprint of where our
 20 landfill is.

21 MS. KRAMER: If you do that and you chip
 22 them, doesn't that kind of spread the contamination
 23 around? Isn't that just of spreading it out instead of
 24 removing it?

25 MS. FANELLI: No.

0020

1 MS. KRAMER: Because it would be taken up
2 in the tree, right?

3 MS. FANELLI: No. We didn't remove the
4 soils, so the stumps were left in place and/or ground in
5 place. It was the same process we used at fill site 1,
6 landfill 2.

7 So we cut the trees, we chipped that
8 material. We left that material onsite. The bulk of the
9 material for landfill E was also left onsite covering the
10 exposed soils as mulch for protection in the storm, and
11 the rest of the trees were hauled off.

12 That's not answering your question. Your
13 question is: Are those trees by nature contaminated
14 because they were growing out of the landfill, and I
15 respond no. That's not how we've historically treated
16 it.

17 The material around their roots,
18 potentially yes, but we didn't disturb any of that
19 material.

20 MR. BERMAN: Does anyone know if a tree --
21 is there any tree that is surviving in contaminated
22 conditions that have branches and trees that offer
23 contaminants to the environment?

24 It seems a bit weird that that would
25 happen, but I'm not knowledgeable about the botany of

0021 1 chemical transferring in trees. I'm just wondering does
2 that exist, actually?

3 MS. FANELLI: Don't think it -- I know
4 that there are studies where there have been purposeful
5 hopes that trees would absorb contaminants for sort of
6 bioremediation, and the only studies that I'm really
7 aware of on that have to do with lead that's like on the
8 highway.

9 I know Caltrans was looking for grass at
10 some point that might help absorb some of those
11 contaminants in the root mass. I don't -- we didn't
12 analyze the leaves on our trees for the content of any of
13 the constituents in the landfills. So we have not done
14 that on the site.

15 MR. BERMAN: It's an interesting question.
16 You would think probably the heavy metals would not
17 transfer, but maybe some of the organic materials that
18 organic contaminants might survive, if they can be
19 absorbed in the liquids.

20 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

21 MR. BERMAN: It seems to me that your
22 question is technically a very interesting question,
23 especially since I take it from Eileen that it's really
24 never been looked at.

25 MS. FANELLI: I don't know if the

0022 1 regulatory folks have, you know, studies that they've
2 done that looked at this. I don't think it's common,
3 particularly for heavy metals.

4 MR. BERMAN: You wouldn't think -- it's
5 the organic materials that might --

6 MS. FANELLI: Although to the extent that
7 vegetation often will help to create organic
8 contaminants, as well. They do some remediation.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: It's actually my
10 recollection that early on, we investigated when the Army
11 was here planting plants that would uptake lead, as you

12 mentioned, and that it was going to take several years
13 and multiple harvests of those plants and that each of
14 those harvests would actually have to be disposed of as
15 hazardous waste due to the content in the plants.

16 So we didn't do it. We didn't select that,
17 is my recollection, because it was going to take so much
18 time and then there might be propagation of seeds down
19 range and a whole bunch of other issues, but I think it
20 can be done. There is a whole field of phytoremediation.

21 MR. BERMAN: Well, the question was really
22 is there a potential for moving the contaminant around by
23 taking the shreds and putting them out on the trails,
24 those nice pure trails and then you'd move materials from
25 a contaminated area and thereby contaminated the trails?

0023

1 MS. NEWTON: Well, the question is is the
2 tree contaminated. That's the question.

3 MS. KRAMER: Would it suck it up in it?

4 MS. NEWTON: Is the tree contaminated
5 before you shred it and put it on the ground? That's
6 your question.

7 MR. BERMAN: Well, it's also kind of a
8 level, too. But if trees can actually absorb lead, then
9 they can probably absorb the organic materials, also.

10 I -- Doug, is this something that we're
11 formally asking for some information on? Because, I
12 mean, I'm looking at us as a citizen's group, and here
13 one of our members has brought up a question of
14 contamination movement from -- from biodegradable
15 materials, and it seems to me that it's an interesting
16 question of which should be answered.

17 Maybe there's absolutely no worry about it,
18 but it's -- it's a -- it's a technically reasonable
19 question and one which is coming from a concerned member
20 of the public.

21 MS. NEWTON: Does DTSC have any comment on
22 that? Are you guys looking -- can trees suck up
23 contamination? Not the roots, but the tree itself?

24 MS. TSUJI: Physically it is possible. It
25 really depends on the concentration of the contamination

0024

1 and, you know, the whole setting is just not one set of
2 factors.

3 Typically metals aren't that readily
4 available for uptake, and these are very, very general
5 terms, ideas that I share tonight.

6 If you do have organics, they can be taken
7 up through the entire system, but they then usually are
8 aspired to the leaf, so they just kind of go off into the
9 air.

10 Some of what occurs within the tree is
11 actually they degrade the -- what they're taking up, just
12 like we do. We intake food and we break it down into
13 basically smaller components and then give off the
14 materials that we don't use.

15 The department has not been deeply involved
16 in issues such as what Doug brought up, utilizing
17 phytoremediation, because plants don't always take it up
18 that well.

19 And again, it's very, very -- when we do
20 try to apply phytoremediation into the remedy selection,
21 you kind of take a look at all the factors, what kind of
22 soil, the pH -- there's just so many factors, but to

23 answer -- to get your answer, you would really have to
24 have a planned approach to sampling the various parts of
25 the tree, the leaves to determine what's been taken up,

0025

1 and just because it's been taken up, it may not be at a
2 concentration that kind of registers.

3 MS. NEWTON: So it sounds like this isn't
4 something that DTSC has been concerned with?

5 MS. TSUJI: Typically, no.

6 MS. NEWTON: I guess what we would say is
7 should you be concerned? Is there a reason why you're
8 not or haven't been?

9 MS. TSUJI: I was unaware that they were
10 using it as mulch personally.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Well --

12 MS. TSUJI: And I'm unaware of whether
13 we've been involved in sites where the trees have been
14 removed and then reused onsite in some other form.

15 MS. NEWTON: It's not the roots of the
16 tree.

17 MS. FANELLI: It's the above ground. It's
18 not the roots. So normally when we take down the trees,
19 we actually leave them onsite and they're ultimately
20 removed during remediation.

21 So, for example, the material that was
22 removed from fill site 1 and landfill 2, it's a huge
23 number of trees. Most of that mulch was used as the site
24 specific erosion controls that season, and the trees
25 themselves are hauled off by tree people.

0026

1 The majority of them go to places that burn
2 them for fuel, although we leave it up to the contractor
3 that takes them away.

4 MR. BERMAN: Or made into pellets and sold
5 as pellet fuel.

6 MS. FANELLI: I don't think there's that
7 so much is they're actually taken to power generation
8 facilities that burn whatever and they're burned there,
9 because they're not high quality wood that is milled or
10 otherwise lumbered.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

12 MS. BLUM: I'm just going to ask this
13 question. Isn't it a little unusual to be working on a
14 site when we have not a decision document yet?

15 MS. FANELLI: No. We've -- I understand
16 that's a concern and it's been brought up before, but we
17 are removing the trees often under -- for other reasons.

18 They're either part of our vegetation
19 management program and we try to -- this is the same as
20 fill site 1 and landfill 2. We try to time it so that it
21 makes sense with other activities or we try to time it so
22 that we can be protective of the bird nesting season,
23 which is what drives when we do tree work.

24 So to try to answer your question --

25 MS. BLUM: I think what I'm trying to get

0027

1 at is maybe this issue would have come up if we had had
2 an opportunity to look at that particular aspect before
3 the trees were logged to discuss the environmental --
4 potential environmental impacts.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, this question
6 that's being raised is -- it is -- as Sam said, it's an
7 interesting one.

8 We had the situation -- it wasn't trees,
9 but it was a pile of sand and soil that came from a
10 supposedly clean site, and that soil was used in two
11 other cases around the Presidio.

12 It turned out to be contaminated with
13 legacy pesticides, I believe it was, and that involved
14 the really expensive going back in and cleaning it up.

15 Well, perhaps if it's being spread on
16 trails, is it being documented where it's being put maybe
17 one would be question.

18 I mean, if we happen to run a test and we
19 found that for whatever there was contamination, we'd
20 know where it's actually going.

21 MS. FANELLI: We do know what we've done
22 with the tree clippings from landfill E, yeah.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: I've noticed -- this is
24 a separate question, but I've noticed that the conveyor
25 where the chipper was was putting it downslope on the toe

0028
1 of landfill E and it was a really significant pile of it,
2 and I think you mentioned that was being put there for
3 the control.

4 MS. FANELLI: They're piling it there, but
5 they are moving it and spreading it to cover the area
6 where there's cuttings to make sure we have basic mulch,
7 and with all the rains we've had, we have not seen any
8 issues with the tree removal sites at all.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess for my
10 principle question about the final disposition, would
11 that be removed?

12 MS. FANELLI: Right. The stuff that's
13 left onsite will be removed. We're using it as a
14 winterization method. We've done the same thing with
15 landfill E.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I guess the
17 question -- the outstanding question is whether that
18 material is by some unfortunate circumstance contaminated
19 by being in the material.

20 MS. NEWTON: Now that you know it's being
21 done, do you think it would be worth checking out the
22 nature of the wood that's been chipped out or let us know
23 if you guys have any concerns?

24 MS. TSUJI: I'll take advantage of talking
25 to our toxicologist as far as the likelihood of uptake

0029
1 based on what we know of the conditions currently at the
2 landfill area.

3 MS. NEWTON: Okay.

4 MS. TSUJI: And then --

5 MS. NEWTON: I think that would help.

6 MR. BERMAN: But I think what you said
7 really clarifies it. It's likely it might be there, but
8 it's likely below cleanup levels, if it was there because
9 of the nature of trees.

10 It would be interesting to know that for
11 sure.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: What would be the --
13 moving on, then, with landfill E draft, what's your
14 thinking about how we will -- the immediate process to
15 give you feedback on that and also ask DTSC to -- how
16 would we want to organize that?

17 MS. FANELLI: We're planning to submit the
18 document hopefully by the end of the month to DTSC for

19 review.

20 MS. TSUJI: Right now, Virginia, the
21 project manager that's been assigned to landfill E has
22 been reading up on the historical documentation to get as
23 much up to speed with the information available.

24 What -- the department has been trying
25 to -- strategizing, and we've been working with our

0030 1 public participation staff so that once we -- similarly
2 to what we did with always getting all these RAP names
3 mixed up.

4 MS. FANELLI: 5?

5 MS. TSUJI: RAP5A.

6 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

7 MS. TSUJI: We'll probably at least do one
8 round of review and comment so that we'll know what our
9 general reading is of the RAP, and we are planning to do
10 a couple things.

11 One would be similar to RAP5A come in and
12 to get an overview and hear what -- questions or comments
13 that you may have in general, so that as we continue our
14 review, we can, you know, take those comments and
15 insights into consideration.

16 And because landfill E is near a
17 residential area, we're also planning to have an open
18 house so that other members of the community can also
19 have an opportunity to come in and query the department
20 or come in and find out about what's going on.

21 MS. KRAMER: And when are you planning on
22 doing that? Do you know yet? Is it February or --

23 MS. TSUJI: You know, the timing will
24 be -- we are hoping if the Draft RAP comes in, we can
25 take a look at it, and keeping our fingers crossed that

0031 1 we'll be able to come to the next -- let Doug and Mark
2 know that we're ready to come in.

3 We've had time to read it and kind of have
4 some preliminary ideas of what's in the document to be
5 able to talk -- see what you have to say the next
6 February RAB meeting.

7 But again, it's kind of -- without a
8 document, it's difficult to come in and share ideas.

9 MS. FANELLI: We're doing everything we
10 can to get the document out as soon as possible. The
11 data that's in it is basically the same data that
12 Geosyntech reviewed last time they were here, which I
13 think was last fall, and you have the data report.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

15 MS. BLANCHETT: I think it's important to
16 note, also, that these activities will take place before
17 the public comment period where we're taking comments for
18 the record, and we look at having these open house
19 activities and also discussions with your group during
20 your February meeting and also having the open house in
21 February, as well.

22 MS. NEWTON: Great. So February would be
23 your goal, then.

24 MS. TSUJI: That's what we have on our
25 calendar. We're hoping.

0032 1 MS. BLANCHETT: These are all part of our
2 pre-public comment activities, where we officially
3 release the document for public document and we take

4 public comments for the record.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: We've found that one
6 thing that's been very helpful for all the members here
7 is if we can circulate something in writing amongst
8 ourselves and that, you know, fine tunes our comments of
9 getting something down on a piece of paper's just a lot
10 more effective at communicating I think than, you know,
11 just talking.

12 I mean, we would certainly like to be able
13 to communicate face-to-face and talking, but particularly
14 the nature of these things getting technical and being
15 able to commit them to paper, having that chance to do
16 that would be important to us.

17 So --

18 MS. BLANCHETT: We talked about that,
19 Denise. We talked about the possibility of what written
20 documents could be given to the RAB after the initial
21 review.

22 MS. TSUJI: Typically what happens is when
23 we get the Draft RAP in, we post it on EnviroStore. Now
24 I don't know if you notice the e-mails that you get. I
25 feature saying if you do want it, hit the link.

0033

1 MS. BLANCHETT: It's an e-mail alert box.
2 You can register, sign up to get automatically notified
3 each time a document is loaded on EnviroStore.

4 MS. TSUJI: They're already on it. We
5 already did that before the feature started.

6 MS. BLANCHETT: Okay. I apologize.

7 MS. TSUJI: Internally, they wanted to
8 know if I still wanted to get the e-mails. And you have
9 to answer yes, I do, because they're doing it in my head
10 backwards.

11 Most of time, if you don't reply, they keep
12 you on the list. Well, it's backwards. Read the e-mail
13 alert that you get. It will ask you "if you want to
14 continue, click here."

15 MS. BLANCHETT: So we anticipate having
16 the workshops and the meetings after that draft as posted
17 on Envirostore; correct?

18 MS. TSUJI: Right. We will post it upon
19 our receipt. That's what we've been doing.

20 I think what Doug's talking about is the
21 RAB members having an opportunity to actually read it,
22 digest it and formulate their own questions or comments
23 or insights that they might have.

24 MS. NEWTON: I think it would be easier --
25 I think for me, I'd like to hear your feedback and that

0034

1 would help me -- I'd like to hear what you guys feel are
2 the most important things that the community members
3 should be aware off from their point of view.

4 MS. TSUJI: What I envision -- I don't
5 remember who all. I had Betty and Jim Polisini come
6 during the development of the RAB during that time
7 period.

8 These are just more or less informal idea
9 exchanges, so that when we go into -- and so that you can
10 become informed and likewise we can become informed so
11 that as we do our review and comments back to the Trust,
12 we'll be able to take your advice and, you know, kind of
13 talk amongst ourselves to see if we can -- you may be
14 looking at this issue slightly different than we are and

15 we're going well, maybe if we ask it that way, it might
16 be better.

17 So you can have that just one-on-one, you
18 know, exchange. We might hear that you need to hear more
19 about a certain aspect of part of the RAP that you want
20 more information on, we can come back.

21 Then what Angela's talking about, this is
22 all before the formal process that the department is
23 legally bound to go to and hold a public meeting to
24 take -- and have a thirty-day comment period where either
25 during the meeting, oral comments are received and/or

0035
1 written comments during that thirty-day period where we
2 have to formally respond to it. That is a very kind of
3 structured formal process.

4 What I am talking about coming to RAB
5 meetings and having open house is extra stuff that we
6 have the option of doing based on what we see as a
7 community want, need.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Sara.

9 MS. SEGAL: I want to ask -- Doug has more
10 of a historic perspective on this.

11 Is it possible to have the official public
12 meeting the same day as the RAB? There was an issue the
13 last time.

14 MS. TSUJI: Well, it really needs to be a
15 department meeting.

16 MS. SEGAL: Right.

17 MS. TSUJI: Because we have to announce it
18 formally in a public notice.

19 MS. SEGAL: I understand that.

20 MS. TSUJI: You would have to forgo your
21 meeting. Not to say 200 people are coming. We have to
22 accommodate that many people.

23 MS. SEGAL: I understand that. It would
24 not be a RAB meeting, but it would be on the date of the
25 regularly scheduled RAB meeting.

0036
1 FACILITATOR KERN: The advantage is that
2 you know these people are available that night to come to
3 some things.

4 MS. TSUJI: For us, we have to juggle
5 multiple staff schedules. Sometimes not everybody is
6 available on the same night.

7 MS. SEGAL: I just raise the issue.

8 MS. TSUJI: And I appreciate that.

9 MS. SEGAL: One time the official public
10 meeting was on a Monday and the public meeting was on a
11 Tuesday.

12 MS. BLANCHETT: We'll take it into
13 consideration.

14 MS. SEGAL: Second Tuesday or the fourth
15 Tuesday.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Denise, do you
17 anticipate at one of those informal meetings, we might
18 get to meet Virginia and talk to her about the project?

19 MS. TSUJI: Yes. Just not everybody was
20 available to bring tonight.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Of course. That would
22 be nice.

23 MS. TSUJI: They're staying home staying
24 warm.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes. It's probably

0037

1 colder inside this room than outside in the parking lot.
2 Well, I really appreciate hearing the plan
3 for how we might interact with all of you in this
4 process.

5 We have been studying the site for a while,
6 so we do have concerns that we're going to be looking for
7 when we see the draft, and hopefully that will be in
8 there, but that will be a really great opportunity to
9 chat with you and Virginia about those issues.

10 MS. TSUJI: Well, and I -- also please
11 e-mail as you think of things, because a lot of times if
12 you ask me a question about uptake on the trees, I'm not
13 an expert on anything, so I would have to tap into the
14 right support staff.

15 So if we know there is a particular area of
16 interest, I could one, try and see if we have in-house
17 knowledgeable people to help participate during the
18 meeting or at least happen into them so that we can do
19 some homework ourselves to be able to give you some
20 intelligent short answers. Maybe not as direct as
21 someone more knowledgeable could.

22 So, you know, if you think of things, you
23 know, even before the RAP comes out, please e-mail --
24 e-mail me, e-mail Virginia and, you know, we'll
25 coordinate with the various folks that are working on --

0038

1 will be working on this site, and there are others within
2 the department not actively involved in the Presidio
3 project.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Other comments on
5 landfill E and the document that will be coming and the
6 process for reviewing? Sam.

7 MR. BERMAN: I just needed a refresher,
8 because memory fails more often than before, but has the
9 geostructure of the landfill been established
10 sufficiently accurately so that one can be confident that
11 you know what the various depths are in the layers?

12 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure, Sam, I
13 understand the question.

14 MR. BERMAN: Well, at one time, in one of
15 the preliminary investigations established a certain geo-
16 structure of the -- as you go down the landfill, the type
17 of soil and the rock formation changes.

18 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

19 MR. BERMAN: And there was some question
20 as to where that occurred and how it actually contoured
21 the landfill region, and the information I do remember
22 was that it was being worked on.

23 It wasn't really conclusive. Maybe that's
24 been updated and that's where my memory was failing.

25 MS. FANELLI: We haven't done any

0039

1 significant investigation -- a little bit. It was in the
2 draft report in terms of depth of the landfill material
3 where it encounters the native subsoils. We did a lot
4 more work that was in that data report on the perimeter
5 and the extent of the waste.

6 So we do feel we have a good handle on its
7 location, if that answers the question.

8 MR. BERMAN: Well, it was my
9 understanding, though, that as you go down from the
10 perimeter from the very bottom, there was several

11 different stages of geostructure that made up the
12 containment, you might say the walls of the landfill
13 area, and it was -- my understanding was that was still
14 something that was under investigation at one time.

15 But what I don't remember is what we have
16 now pretty conclusive understanding of what the
17 formations are as you go from surface down to the bottom.

18 MS. FANELLI: I believe we do know what
19 the surrounding bedrock geology is. Like Denise, I'm not
20 the PM assigned to it, but that is going to be all -- the
21 native geology and the hydrogeology will all be discussed
22 in the document.

23 MR. BERMAN: Right.

24 MS. FANELLI: So I do believe we have a
25 pretty good handle on what the surrounding geology is,

0040

1 yes. We have a better handle now, too, on its perimeter,
2 on the edges at the top.

3 MR. BERMAN: That's all going to be part
4 of the report?

5 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

6 MR. BERMAN: It wasn't something that I
7 should have read and known before tonight?

8 MS. FANELLI: You would probably know some
9 of it because there's been a lot of episodes of
10 investigation at landfill E. Much of that information
11 has been previously published in other documents.

12 The new data that we had recently published
13 or issued in the report in September and that's a
14 document that you had a presentation on by Geosyntech and
15 they talked about what they did.

16 So the -- the RAP and F/S will be based on
17 a compilation of assume of that information, historical
18 as well as if new information.

19 MR. BERMAN: I think I missed that
20 meeting.

21 MS. FANELLI: You may not have been there.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: It just occurs to me
23 based on your questions, Sam, whether we might also
24 coordinate when we have our informal meeting with --
25 perhaps with Virginia there, that we might have the

0041

1 Geosyntech people, as well.

2 MS. FANELLI: I can make that available if
3 we plan in advance.

4 MR. BERMAN: That would be really nice
5 just in case we ask a really stupid question, we can be
6 told that.

7 MS. FANELLI: There's no stupid question.
8 You know that, Sam.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I think this
10 review is coming together nicely. So we'll be looking
11 forward to it and we'll try to get ourselves organized in
12 advance of that.

13 MR. BERMAN: Would that review be a
14 committee meeting or would it be at the regular RAB
15 meeting?

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, it kind of
17 depends on how things sort out with the actual document
18 release. The fourth Tuesday could potentially be -- we
19 don't know. We just don't know when it's coming to come
20 out, so we'll have to plan it when we --

21 MS. TSUJI: I'm looking at the calendar

22 right now and looking at end of January, which will be
23 about a week our time for review, and I hate to sound
24 like a broken record, but the state still has some staff
25 of which the scientist and engineers are still on three-

0042

1 day furlough a month. Not everybody.
2 So I have no choice but to -- it's called
3 self-directed furlough, so the staff get to pick what day
4 they're not working, because they're not getting paid.
5 So I have to juggle three days a month for
6 each person not being in the office available to us to do
7 work.

8 So -- and it's kind of hard for me to say
9 no, you can't take a furlough. So if we choose a day
10 prior to the 8th of February, which is the first Tuesday,
11 it takes just that one day away from review time.

12 So we will try to the best we can to do,
13 you know, the -- depending on timing, we may need to ask
14 to come to the other meeting.

15 But I will coordinate with Doug and Mark
16 and make sure that we are available.

17 MR. BERMAN: So it's possible that it
18 would be at the next RAB meeting in February?

19 MS. TSUJI: Yeah. Very possibly. We'll
20 have to take a look at what we get and staff timing and
21 workload.

22 MR. BERMAN: Well, that's pretty exciting.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else on

24 Landfill E?

25 Item number 4C was just kind of another

0043

1 placeholder looking at what else might be in our
2 immediate future, if there was anything. We had
3 potentially several documents coming out this year.

4 Anything following on closely with E?

5 MS. FANELLI: We are working actively on
6 the Mountain Lake RAP, so I imagine that's the next major
7 document. It's behind obviously Landfill E. I'd say by
8 at least a month from our perspective, but that would be
9 another document that will be coming out.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: So perhaps March?

11 MS. FANELLI: I'm thinking, yeah, end of
12 member February, March, something like that. Probably
13 March is more realistic.

14 And then we're continuing to -- not the
15 terms of documents, but work that we're doing to get
16 ready to do final construction of fill site 1 and Landfill
17 2. So we're getting ready to go back out and finalize
18 some of the elements that are in there.

19 We are continuing to work on 207/231 as I
20 mentioned last time and we're moving ahead with the idea
21 of doing -- I'm not going to use the right word. The
22 thermal treatment of soil in situ and are preparing a
23 work plan for review by Agnes for that. So that should
24 be coming out.

25 And then we're preparing to implement later

0044

1 in the summer, we're working with the Doyle folks on
2 scheduling the excavation of the 231 area. That time's
3 still a little bit uncertain.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: In the summer sometime?

5 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It will be sometime
6 in the summer for that.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: With the thermal
8 treatment for 207/231, I'm not sure I remember the amount
9 of time that took. I remember you were saying that you
10 inserted these rods and they heat up the soil.

11 How long does that go for?

12 MS. FANELLI: It's a three- to four-month
13 process. It's based on the amount of material in the
14 ground that you're trying to volatilize.

15 And so I'm giving you what I've been told
16 from the consultants, which is Mike Beck with Geomatrix,
17 and they've indicated based on their bench scale analysis
18 a three- to four-month period.

19 Once they get the soil at the temperature,
20 which is about 120 C.

21 MR. CHESTER: Capturing the vapors?

22 MS. FANELLI: Yeah, they do that, and when
23 we have a little bit more information, I'm certainly
24 happy to share some of the details, but they'll heat the
25 soil with some type of probe that's actually pushed into

0045 1 the ground, there's several of them. They'll collect
2 vapors.

3 They'll actually insulate the top of the
4 ground and will likely insulate the historic wall so that
5 they're keeping that heat in there and then the vapors
6 are captured and then somehow captured or treated.

7 MR. BUDROE: That's going to be electrical
8 heating?

9 MS. FANELLI: We use electricity.

10 MR. BUDROE: Just out of curiosity, is
11 that going to run off of Presidio power or --

12 MS. FANELLI: Presidio power. There's
13 poles nearby.

14 MR. BUDROE: You'll have enough current so
15 that the lines will be able to handle it.

16 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is we don't
17 need any auxiliary power from generators. There's a good
18 question.

19 I don't have enough information on how it's
20 going to work, but I can get that.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Did you mention that
22 there's going to be some type of pipes for extracting
23 vapors?

24 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is there
25 are peisometers that are used, but I don't have the

0046 1 details on the layout, so I don't want to give you
2 misinformation, but as soon as I get it, I'll be happy to
3 share it with you.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. That would be
5 interesting to know what the concentration, is it
6 collected or does it just go to the air?

7 MS. FANELLI: It's collected and it's
8 processed.

9 MS. FARRES: And I think you have to have
10 it airborne.

11 MS. FANELLI: Potentially so.

12 MS. FARRES: Airborne is regulated.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Okay. So
14 we have Mountain Lake coming perhaps in late February/
15 March. We have some construction fill site 1, landfill 2,
16 207/231, the thermal treatment, three- to four-month time
17 frame and excavation from 231 soil.

MS. FANELLI: Those are some of the large things. We're also working on the closure document, the construction completion report for 9, 10.

Eventually that will be issued for review. And then we'll be working on the completion documents for fill site 1 and landfill 2 at the same time as we finish construction there, as well.

Jan.

MS. BLUM: When you get real ready for the excavation of quartermaster reach, would it be possible to give us an advanced date on that?

And the second question would be: Would it be possible to observe that? People have been very interested in that site for very many years, and if possible, to have a gallery.

MS. FANELLI: That's a good thought. Certainly I can give you advanced notice.

MS. BLUM: Good.

MS. FANELLI: I'll talk to the public affairs folks and others when we go through our N square process to see if there's a place to create some type of place to observe.

MS. BLUM: Thank you.

FACILITATOR KERN: That's a really nice idea. I know previously they put up the green fences so people can't see, but I know people will be interested, so I want to echo that idea.

Anything else on upcoming documents for projects? Any thoughts?

MR. BERMAN: Can I get just an update since I missed a couple of meetings? Is Caltrans going to contribute anything to the Mountain Lake remediation?

MS. FANELLI: That question's yet to be

answered. We're still in a lawsuit with them. We certainly hope so.

So that lawsuit hasn't been resolved yet. I believe the court dates are set for May, and so the attorneys are still working through the process of all the steps that happen before that.

MR. BERMAN: Will it actually go to court?

MS. FANELLI: I don't know. It can go to court. It's calendared.

MR. BERMAN: My other question was any complications arising with the Caltrans on the Doyle Drive construction?

MS. FANELLI: Not that I'm aware of other than the rain in particular. My understanding is that it slowed them down at this point.

We are taking colma soils from Doyle Drive and stockpiling them for Trust use at remediation sites and other project sites that we need the soils for backfill.

So that's the only involvement I've really had with the Doyle Drive. There's a big pile in the dust bowl of colma soil.

MS. NEWTON: The project is definitely moving along, though. Today my bus going on to Park Presidio coming south from the bridge, we now have a

new -- all new piece of road prior to the --

MS. FANELLI: Right.

3 MS. NEWTON: It's definitely moving along.
4 MS. KRAMER: Is it like temporary road?
5 MS. NEWTON: Well, I'm not sure what it's
6 going to be like, but they keep having to redirect
7 everything to make progress.

8 So it seems like every month the bus driver
9 has to know a little bit of a drive route to get through
10 there. Pretty exciting.

11 MR. BERMAN: Assuming you're going to
12 sample all this soil.

13 MS. FANELLI: For soil that's been used
14 for remediation sites, we follow the DTSC guidance on
15 sampling, and then we use our own good judgment in
16 sampling tests, as well, to make sure we're not creating
17 a problem for ourselves.

18 MR. BERMAN: Because a lot of useful soil
19 is coming out of that.

20 MS. FANELLI: A lot of the soil that we're
21 taking is coming from quite deep at this point. It's
22 nice stuff. It's clean stuff; hasn't seen daylight for
23 tens of thousands or more of years. It's good material.

24 MR. BERMAN: Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Anything

0050

1 else at all for discussion on item 4?

2 Item 5, DTSC status update. Over to DTSC.
3 We're pleased that you're here.

4 MS. TSUJI: Thank you.

5 We will, again -- because of unfortunate
6 budget constraints, we will try to attend as many as we
7 can, but the project work will take precedence over
8 attendance.

9 So if it helps me justify staff travel, if
10 you have some specific things. That's why I'm
11 encouraging you to shoot e-mails to us during the course
12 of the month before the RAB meeting rather than waiting
13 here so I can say that there are specific issues that
14 they want no hear from you or share or hear directly.

15 Just kind of regular routine, I have to
16 balance staff time here versus weekday work time.

17 MS. NEWTON: I think we can work with
18 that. What I would like to see is either you choose it
19 or we choose it, a convenient meeting time and we just
20 dedicate the first part of that meeting to you guys, and
21 I don't think it has to be every -- it doesn't have to be
22 every meeting. We just haven't seen you in a very long
23 time.

24 MS. TSUJI: We've had resource issues,
25 so -- and we had a retirement. I inherited all the North

0051

1 Coast as territory to cover. We're just spread very,
2 very, very thin. It's becoming a little more cumbersome.

3 I was at EPA this afternoon and I came back
4 and I swung by Angela's office just to let her know that
5 I was back in the building so we could drive over here,
6 and she goes, "They're taking away our cell phones."

7 MS. BLANCHETT: We're asked to do creative
8 cost cuttings.

9 MS. NEWTON: To pay for your own cell
10 phone.

11 MS. TSUJI: Well, it's a major expense.

12 MS. SEGAL: Twenty million savings.

13 MS. BLANCHETT: We're being asked to who

14 is necessarily in great need of a cell phone.

15 MS. TSUJI: I turned mine in three, four,
16 five months ago. Personally, I was tired of carrying two
17 cell phones.

18 MS. BLANCHETT: So we anticipate more
19 directives in terms of cutting our resource cost.

20 MS. TSUJI: They're going to like re-
21 evaluating the number of state cars, like I drove over in
22 a state car. Number of state cars issued to each of the
23 offices. So they're hunkering down.

24 MS. BLUM: Denise, I was under the
25 impression that DTSC was paid for by the Presidio Trust

0052
1 and other contractors.

2 Is that not correct?

3 MS. TSUJI: Our time, the DTSC staff time
4 that works on the Presidio project, we do charge what we
5 refer to the site. So the Trust does get quarterly
6 invoices.

7 However, example as to today's announcement
8 of the cell phones, it is an executive order from the
9 governor and it's across the board regardless of funding
10 source.

11 So there are -- there will be instances --
12 even though we're getting reimbursed for time and
13 resources, it may be a blanket across the board cut that
14 the department has really no discretion in -- in doing it
15 any other way.

16 MS. BLUM: Well, I think my major concern
17 if you cut back so far that you really can't be effective
18 in your job, that you really need more people to help you
19 so that you can do the kind of job.

20 It's so important what you're doing. We
21 don't want to foul it up.

22 MS. TSUJI: We hear you. We have had
23 three retirements in the Berkeley cleanup program since
24 the last couple months and we are not allowed to rehire
25 backfill those.

0053
1 MS. NEWTON: But you guys still have an
2 obligation -- it was my understanding that you did to the
3 Trust and to the community to -- to look at the job that
4 are being done and make sure they're being done safely.
5 That's still there.

6 MS. BLANCHETT: It's our oversight role,
7 but I just want to add onto it. We do have a freeze on
8 hiring, so we're not able to backfill when people leave.

9 So we're looking at our resources and
10 trying to determine the most effective use of these
11 resources, and in terms of the Presidio and my role in
12 public participation, we're trying to strategize, for
13 example, landfill E, how to best provide the outreach
14 necessary to both the RAB and the community and be
15 proactive with our resources.

16 MS. NEWTON: Well, regardless of the
17 outreach part of it, you have an obligation I think -- I
18 thought to work with -- to oversee the job that the Trust
19 is doing. That is hap -- regardless of what you do with
20 us.

21 MS. TSUJI: My priorities have been to
22 focus in on the technical work and something such as
23 attending the RAB meeting may need to be put on the back
24 burner.

25 MS. NEWTON: But you're still interfacing
0054
1 with the Trust as much as you ever were before?
2 MS. TSUJI: Yes.
3 MS. NEWTON: I guess maybe because Bob was
4 here more.

5 Do you have less time to deal with the work
6 the Trust is doing? Is that -- could it be -- it's not
7 going to slow these guys down?

8 MS. TSUJI: I actually put more resources.
9 MS. BLANCHETT: I can testify to that. I
10 just think doing these -- with the three furlough days
11 and the limited amount of time, we're really asked to
12 evaluate what we participate in outside of, you know, the
13 department hours in terms of these evening meetings with
14 the various RABs throughout the state and the various
15 CAGs, Community Advisory Groups.

16 So we're really being asked things like
17 can you go every other month? Can you go quarterly? Can
18 you provide monthly updates?

19 MS. NEWTON: How about -- then for us --
20 the members of the RAB to look at what you're doing and
21 to see what your concerns have been that may be our
22 concerns, is there something -- how do we see the
23 interaction between you guys? How do we know that's
24 happening? How do we know your concerns are?

25 MS. BLANCHETT: Well, one thing that came
0055

1 to mind as I sit here, this is my first meeting with this
2 group in this capacity. I was formally a media
3 representative in my other lifetime a few years ago for
4 the department, but on occasion with other RABs, we
5 provide a technical monthly update to -- to the group
6 that even if we're not present, you would know what we're
7 working on that month with the Presidio Trust and other
8 agencies that we work with.

9 MS. NEWTON: Well, maybe the Envirostore
10 is the best way for us to keep track of what you guys are
11 interacting, what your concerns have been on the Trust
12 project.

13 We were always aware of that with Bob.
14 Even if he hadn't gone to the meeting, there were all
15 these documents that were being passed around and maybe
16 that's what's different. Maybe we just don't see it.

17 MS. BLANCHETT: I need it in context, too,
18 as well. I think that would be helpful. I don't know,
19 Denise, maybe I'm speaking prematurely, but
20 I think that would be helpful if we could provide a
21 monthly update, a written.

22 MS. NEWTON: Yeah.

23 MS. TSUJI: I know I was doing it and I
24 did let it slip.

25 MR. BUDROE: I would not want to depend on
0056

1 documents being posted on Envirostore between the Trust,
2 DTSC, the Water Board and the RAB. I think a monthly
3 update would be good.

4 MS. NEWTON: Not necessarily physically
5 here, but just something that we could read. Something
6 directed to our group.

7 MS. BLANCHETT: Right.

8 MR. BUDROE: Yes, with the caveat would
9 quarterly meetings work? I would say no, because we

10 don't have enough opportunity to ask questions that for
11 example that monthly update might generate.

12 MS. BLANCHETT: If it's a priority for you
13 to have a DTSC representative here, the technical
14 representative here so you can address questions to that
15 person and they can respond to you, I think we should
16 just make the request and we'll try to accommodate you.

17 MS. NEWTON: Or an update at least that we
18 could put into our minutes -- as part of our agenda.

19 MS. BLANCHETT: Exactly.

20 MS. NEWTON: Something that's directed to
21 us that deals with whatever updates you have, concerns
22 that we should have.

23 MS. KRAMER: And I wonder about if you
24 can't be present at every meeting, let's say it was every
25 other meeting or something, whether there's a way to set

0057

1 up, you know, a teleconference or something so that we --
2 either the regular meeting or the committee meeting so
3 that Virginia or whoever it is, if she can't come over
4 here all the time, for the first hour of the meeting or
5 the second hour, whatever it might be, for some time slot
6 would be available, whoever the manager is and we can
7 have a list of questions or just ask -- have some direct
8 communications.

9 Sometimes if you get a written document, it
10 can be fairly general and not very specific and it might
11 not address some of the concerns that we have. Something
12 like that could be set up.

13 MS. TSUJI: I think a few months ago, I
14 did tell Eileen that "we can't come because of
15 conflicting schedules, but can I tap into the room?" And
16 unfortunately, this room doesn't have that.

17 MS. FANELLI: I can find out if there
18 is -- since we won't be in this building probably from
19 here on out for the next foreseeable future, I'll see if
20 that can be arranged wherever we'll be meeting, which I
21 think will likely be the Golden Gate Club, but I'll find
22 out if we can get a patch.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Sarah.

24 MS. SEGAL: I just want to -- just to
25 point out, because of Jan's question, and she stepped out

0058

1 now. Regardless of across the board furlough -- across
2 the board cuts that the governor's making. Every agency
3 is tightening their belts and being asked to make cuts, I
4 thought Jan's question went to the issue of Superfund
5 funding for RAB and for -- through the Trust, the FTE
6 allotment that those federal dollars are paying to -- for
7 DTSC FTE.

8 So I think that's what Jan was asking, but
9 she's not here.

10 MS. NEWTON: I think the point -- if
11 you're operating a staff on --

12 MS. SEGAL: That was the question.

13 MS. NEWTON: All these missing people.
14 Even if you're being paid for the time, but you don't
15 have the staff to do it.

16 MS. SEGAL: Then you shouldn't take the
17 money.

18 MS. TSUJI: Angela and I are charging to
19 the site, but if we don't come, we aren't charging for
20 the site.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: One thing that I would
22 offer for your consideration, as well, if you're thinking
23 about how we can get together enough, we might also have
24 a small group of us be able to come over to your offices
25 during the day, during the week to chat, if that would

0059

1 be -- I don't know. Just off-the-cuff.
2 MS. TSUJI: That's probably more doable in
3 that it is during the regular workday. Basically my
4 hands are tied in granting overtime. There is no
5 overtime. There is no compensated time off.

6 Staff have -- depending on if it's a
7 furlough week, a 32-hour week, a 40-hour week and I could
8 have someone go to evening meetings, which means
9 somewhere during the day of other work days, they're not
10 going to be available to do work.

11 That's the balance.

12 MS. NEWTON: Regardless of who's paying
13 them, they're not going to do more work than required.

14 MS. SEGAL: We made it before that a small
15 group of people could meet at DTSC over in Berkeley. If
16 you weren't able to come, that kind of follow-up
17 communication would be available to the RAB.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: We really appreciate
19 your constraints. This is from our perspective something
20 that we've been working on 17 years, and it's -- once it
21 gets set, it's in perpetuity and it's a multi-billion
22 dollar decision.

23 So we need to be incredibly thoughtful and
24 careful and communicate a lot with you over this next
25 time period --

0060

1 MS. BLANCHETT: Right.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: -- in whatever ways we
3 can do it.

4 MS. TSUJI: We will take these suggestions
5 back and brainstorm and see what we can facilitate our
6 participation at the RAB meeting.

7 You may see different faces. That's one
8 thing, I like continuity, but, you know, I may have to
9 send someone who may not be as knowledgeable about
10 particular things on a project, because that particular
11 project manager isn't available.

12 But at a minimum, they can be a scribe and
13 take lots of notes to take back to the office.

14 MR. BERMAN: As a personal comment, the
15 idea of a monthly report means that someone gets assigned
16 to do that, takes staff time to do that and it's kind of
17 a general thing. It's also a document that's left
18 behind.

19 In a sense, for me personally speaking, the
20 direct question and answer with the person is much more
21 valuable than the monthly report, which whoever writes it
22 has got a limited time to do it, not going to say a lot
23 and maybe not have a specific set of questions in mind.

24 MS. NEWTON: But it gives us something to
25 think about and to give feedback on. Not to mention the

0061

1 fact that not everybody's here every month.

2 In this way, the people that aren't meeting
3 will still get a chance to see what's going on. On a
4 regular basis, we'll always know what DTSC's doing.
5 That's what I like about that.

6 MR. BLANCHETT: And we understand that
7 face-to-face contact would be the most ideal situation.
8 We're just trying to use our resources most effectively
9 and see how we could assist --

10 MR. BERMAN: Right.

11 MS. BLANCHETT: -- in building upon this
12 relationship and improving the communication between the
13 department and the RAB.

14 MS. TSUJI: Each of the project managers
15 have multiple projects they're working on. So Virginia
16 does not only have Presidio Landfill E to work on. She
17 has other projects, also.

18 So --

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. We hear. We
20 hear what you're saying.

21 MS. BLANCHETT: But we appreciate your
22 suggestion and even the small working group that meets
23 during the week, because those are the kind of ideas that
24 we're looking for and we try to seek creatively and
25 utilizing our resources.

0062

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much.

2 Any other thoughts or comments on this?

3 We appreciate very much that you're here
4 tonight and we had this opportunity to talk with you
5 about it.

6 Agnes, anything from you?

7 I notice there have been a lot of requests
8 for closure and NFA.

9 MR. BERMAN: Tank closure.

10 MS. FARRES: That's pretty much ongoing,
11 yeah. I think I got two more requests, at least, today
12 or in the last few days.

13 MS. FANELLI: You got three the first of
14 the year, one was a clarification on some questions for
15 two tanks, four tanks that fell out of our group of tanks
16 that were substantiated.

17 It turns out they're real and we found the
18 closure documents for them. They were all closed by the
19 Army a long time ago, but we found the documents so we
20 could, you know, tie that bow.

21 And then we submitted closure on the second
22 set of eight tanks, which are the unsubstantiated tanks
23 that we don't think ever existed.

24 MS. FARRES: Yeah. So my goal has been
25 to, you know, deal with one closure request a month, but

0063

1 because of the furloughs, that's slowed down a little
2 bit, but trying to keep up.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

4 Any --

5 MR. BERMAN: The question for Eileen. Is
6 there kind of a document that lists all the tank closures
7 and a summary document, something that if you wanted
8 to -- got curious about some of those closures, you could
9 go to a file that has all of them in it?

10 MS. FANELLI: Well, I'd like to think that
11 we had one single file with all of our information in it
12 about tanks. We do have a summary table, yes. We keep
13 the history of a tank for each tank.

14 I think the list is 561 or so tanks all
15 totaled and we're basically on top of it. There's very
16 few outstanding tanks.

17 So yes, we do maintain a list and we do
18 maintain a database where we keep track of all of the
19 documents that support closure in addition to any closure
20 letters that we get, we do keep track of those whether
21 it's from Agnes or the county.

22 MS. FARRES: The Water Board maintains a
23 database. So for each tank that I close, that's
24 accompanied by a site closure summary form that lists all
25 of the important information.

0064 1 MR. BERMAN: Right. That's for that one
2 tank, but I was wondering whether there's a compendium
3 for all of them.

4 MS. FARRES: That's so much.

5 MR. BERMAN: That's really a nice success
6 story. In terms of the amount of money that was put in
7 and the number of tanks that you had to deal with and the
8 number of successful closures, it's one of the -- at
9 least looked at from the outside as one of the great
10 successes of the remediation program.

11 MS. FANELLI: Thank you, Sam, and you
12 bring up a good point, because as we look towards
13 hopefully completing the program, imaginatively working
14 with our GIS guys and our database people, so that we
15 maintain records in a way so that we are successful in
16 telling that story.

17 So if we need to access that information in
18 the future, either for land use control or part of our
19 dig permit, that we just want to know that we did pull a
20 tank there if anything is found in the future, that we
21 have that available availability for us.

22 We are trying to organize not just the
23 tanks, but any of our remediation information in a GIS
24 type format so that all of these documents are accessible
25 in the future to people who need them.

0065 1 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

2 Any public comment tonight or new business?

3 MS. FANELLI: I actually have one thing.
4 I'm out of town the last week in January, and I am
5 struggling right now to find someone to open the door for
6 our planning meeting.

7 So I don't know if you have other options
8 or other locations, but the Trust may not be available on
9 that Tuesday.

10 I'm not usually gone, but I am going to Los
11 Angeles and it is sort of a mini vacation. A vacation in
12 LA.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Just don't breathe
14 while you're down there.

15 Very good. So we have some action items,
16 then. Finding a location for our next meeting and
17 organizing ourselves with respect to landfill E and
18 communicating with DTSC about all that organizing with
19 the Trust. And then we have things coming down the road.

20 Are there any other items before we close?

21 MR. BERMAN: I'd just like to elaborate on
22 the communication with DTSC. Denise has really said that
23 we couple in developing consistent interaction with DTSC.
24 If they heard from us about significant issues.

25 So to me, we should pick up on that and
0066 1 actually try to think about what we can do, because we

2 want to have this interaction with DTSC, I think some
3 action on our part would be useful.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I agree, Sam. We
5 had a discussion about the trees at landfill E, and I
6 think it was mentioned at the last meeting that there
7 were some peripheral trees taken down, but I didn't
8 really understand the scope of that until I saw it, and
9 that was only last Thursday.

10 So I get around to everything as much as I
11 can, and some of these things just, you know, we're
12 trying to stay ahead of them as much as we can.

13 But I think you're right as to when we have
14 questions, we get them over to DTSC.

15 I guess, Denise, one question that I would
16 have. What would be the -- if we have technical
17 questions, say, on landfill E, would we copy to you and
18 Angela and Virginia and the Trust and everybody on the
19 whole -- all this stuff that we're thinking or --

20 MS. TSUJI: If you wish, at a minimum,
21 internally for DTSC, Virginia and I.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. All right.

23 MS. TSUJI: For public participation,
24 we'll kind of include them in. It's up to Virginia and I
25 to track down the technical resources to work with.

0067

1 FACILITATOR KERN: We'll try to get that.

2 MR. CHESTER: Maybe at our committee
3 meetings, we could have a standing line item that would
4 be DTSC discussion points; not that they have to be
5 developed on that night, but just kind of as a way
6 station so that the people that show up at the committee
7 meeting can just hear what the DTSC issues forming either
8 from your work outside -- in between meetings or maybe
9 somebody would bring an item up.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: That's a good
11 suggestion. I got that.

12 Anything else?

13 Well, again, let me thank DTSC for being
14 here tonight and to the Water Board for your very
15 consistent participation, the Park Service, of course the
16 Trust for being here every meeting, and particularly to
17 the community members for starting off another year in
18 the cold in this room.

19 We'll have to pay attention to our next
20 meeting where it's going to be. We'll have to figure
21 that out, the committee meeting and then remember, we
22 don't know where the next regular meeting is going to be,
23 but we'll find that out.

24 MS. FANELLI: And that's my
25 responsibility. I'll let everybody know where it's

0068

1 scheduled.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Thanks
3 everyone. Without objection, meeting adjourned.

4 (The meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM).

5 ---oOo---

6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0069
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF CALI FORNIA)
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCI SCO)

I, the undersigned, hereby certi fy that the
discussion in the foregoing arbi tration was taken at the
time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
full, true and complete record of said matter.

I further certi fy that I am not of counsel or
attorney for ei ther or any of the parties in the
foregoing arbi tration and capti on named, or in any way
interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRI CKMAN, CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator
Mark Youngkin
4 Eileen Fanelli
Brian Ullensvang
5 Denise Tjuji
Radhika Majhail
6 Agnes Farres
Paul Scardina
7 Julie Cheever
Sara Segal
8 Gloria Gee
Jan Blum
9 Julian Hultgren
Toni Kramer
10 Sam Berman
Jim Ketcham
11 John Chester

12 Presentations by:

13 Chris Hunt
John Fortuna

14

15 ---o0o---

16 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
17 of the Meeting, and on February 8, 2011, 7:07 PM at the
18 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
19 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
20 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
21 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

22 ---o0o---

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	6
6	4) Discussions & Presentation:	
7	A: Presentation by Geosyntech -	7
8	B: Status of Ongiong Projects - Presidio Trust	71
9	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates/Inputs:	
10	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC -	29
11	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - None	
12	7) New Business - None	
13	8) Public Comment - None	
14	9) Action Items and Agenda Items	78
15	10)Adjournment:	78
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Good evening,
2 everybody. Welcome to the Presidio Restoration Advisory
3 Board meeting for February 2011. I'd like to welcome the
4 Presidio Trust and the National Park Service, the Water
5 Board and DTSC. Thanks very much being here tonight. Of
6 course all of our community members and any members of
7 the public that are here. Thanks for coming out.

8 I see some new faces. Perhaps it would be
9 appropriate to do a quick set of introductions. I'm Doug
10 Kern. I'm a community member. Been on the board since
11 1996.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: Hello. I'm Mark Youngkin.
13 I'm the community co-chair. I've been on the board since
14 '95.

15 MS. GEE. I'm Gloria Gee, Community Member,
16 and I can't recall the -- I came after Doug and Mark. I
17 think it's '98.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: That's still a young
19 man.

20 MS. SEGAL: Sara Segal. I'm a community
21 member and I can't remember.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: Brian Ullensvang With the
23 National Park Service.

24 MS. FARRES: Agnes Farres with the Water
25 Board.

1 MS. KRAMER: Toni Kramer and I'm a
2 community member.

3 MR. BERMAN: Sam Berman. I've been a
4 member since '98.

5 MR. HULTGREN: Julian Hultgren. I'm a
6 community member.

7 MS. BLUM: Jan Blum, community member

8 MR. SCARDINA: I'm Paul Scardina and I am
9 the Park Projects Implementation Manager for the Presidio
10 Trust.

11 MS. MAJHAIL: My name is Radhika Majhail
12 and I'm a preservation specialist.

13 MS. TSUJI: Last month, Angela Blanchett
14 Attended. Angela is not available, so this person was
15 available tonight.

16 I am Denise Tsuji With the Department of Toxic
17 Substances Control.

18 MS. FANELLI: Eileen Fanelli with Presidio
19 Trust Remedial Action.

20 MR. HUNT: Chris Hunt with GSC.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much.
22 Again, welcome everyone.

23 Does everyone have an agenda? Are there
24 any changes to the agenda? It's fairly loose. Status of
25 our ongoing projects, so if you have updates and if you

1 have sites that we might have questions about. See how
2 that goes.

3 Very good. Any announcements? Then we may
4 as well go --

5 MS. FANELLI: I'll go back to
6 announcements. Nothing earth-shattering, but the
7 Officer's Club is officially not going to be our location
8 anymore.

9 We'll be meeting here at the Golden Gate
10 Club. They'll likely be assigning us the same room or a
11 smaller one. I'll make an announcement when I have more
12 information.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: We already appreciate
14 the level of warmth in here versus the other location.
15 It's so much more relaxed.

16 MR. BERMAN: In the spirit of being a
17 pioneer.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: That's true. Very
19 good. So we can leave it to you, then, to start, if you
20 have --

21 MS. FANELLI: Sure. I think at our last
22 meeting, we had discussed the status of landfill E and we
23 had really hoped to have a Preliminary Draft RAP for
24 landfill E out, and we don't have it out, but Geosyntech
25 is here to give you an update.

1 We hope to have it out very shortly, but we
2 wanted to give you a review of its content.

3 So if we can, we can start with landfill E.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. You have to
5 push the button. Oh, there it goes.

6 MR. FORTUNA: As I said in the
7 introduction, I'm John Fortuna, Geosyntech Consultants.
8 We're the consultants for landfill E and we prepared this
9 short presentation to give you an update on the status of
10 our closure design and the Draft RAP document.

11 The document we're producing is a
12 combination of a Feasibility Study and a Remedial Action
13 Plan. It replaces the previous Draft FS document that
14 was issued in 2005 and includes the Remedial Action Plan.
15 It's specific to landfill E.

16 We were looking at some of our earlier
17 investigations, and that's being pursued on a separate
18 track.

19 We had prepared a preliminary draft and
20 submitted it to DTSC. They're in the process of
21 reviewing it, and we expect to incorporate your comments
22 and issue a draft for public comment perhaps later this
23 month, but most likely early March.

24 MS. FANELLI: We actually -- we've been in
25 communication and discussions. When we submit the formal

1 Draft RAP to them, the RAP will be copied to all
2 stakeholders at that point. But we're still developing
3 that preliminary document for formal review.

4 MR. BERMAN: You understand that we would
5 be privileged to see the draft report and actual public
6 comment; is that right?

7 MS. FANELLI: Right.

8 MR. FORTUNA: We looked at three
9 alternatives in the feasibility study for landfill E.
10 Alternative one is the no action alternative, which is
11 the baseline that's always considered in a feasibility
12 study.

13 Alternative two is clean closure and
14 monitoring. That's the complete excavation, removal.

15 Alternative three is containment and
16 monitoring, and that alternative consists of an
17 engineered cover system, a landfill gas collection and
18 venting system and a surface water drainage system.

19 We use the DTSC threshold and balancing
20 criteria for these different alternatives, and based on
21 that evaluation selected alternative three, which is the
22 containment alternative.

23 It meets the ARARs. It's protective of
24 human health and the environment. It's consistent with
25 the Trust overall planning process and master documents.

1 It's relatively easy to implement and provides the best
2 cost/benefit ratio and meets green remediation
3 established by DTSC.

4 The FS RAP document itself would go to
5 various details and different criteria and how to do
6 them, things like that.

7 The components of this alternative are
8 engineered cover that's placed over compacted foundation
9 layer of fill material. As I mentioned, the landfill gas
10 collection and venting system.

11 Surface water drainage system throughout
12 surface water of landfill. The groundwater monitoring,
13 which includes surface monitoring, landfill gas
14 monitoring and cover monitoring, always institutional
15 control.

16 We're going to talk a little bit about
17 the -- some different design elements that we're looking
18 at as part of this process.

19 MR. HUNT: So the -- what we're going to
20 go the next few slides, going to show you a conceptual
21 layout that you'll see in the FS draft. All of the
22 stuff, all the details and the grading, all these things
23 that you're going to see are all very conceptual. It's
24 all done in early phases and has been done in the last
25 couple months working with Trust partners in Planning and

1 Natural Resources in trying to come up with a design that
2 can fit the needs as best as possible as well as the
3 remediation goals.

4 I'll show you a little bit of this. It's
5 not going to match with what actually gets built. It's
6 just conceptual work. I'll show you the conceptual
7 layout, show you surface water channels.

8 What you'll see for surface water channel
9 is the FS RAP, the landfill material. Some of the recent
10 data on landfill gas that has been collected.

11 I won't be going over the geotechnical.
12 That's all detailed design. That's all in the feasible
13 document.

14 It will be design document which comes
15 afterwards, which is actually going to have details of
16 the design, and we're not going to go over the hydro-
17 geology data.

18 That data was collected last year and we
19 haven't checked new data for this project.

20 So like I mentioned, this is an early
21 conceptual layout. This is what you'll see, essentially
22 what you'll see in the FS draft document.

23 The grades are going to change.
24 Everything's -- a lot of things are changing as we go
25 through the building process, but the key features. We

1 have the western tributary, water channel comes down to
2 the southwest corner of the landfill.

3 We have additional water that comes down
4 these hills here off and from the access road in the
5 back. We're going to be routing that water around and to
6 the base of the landfill and down the base of the
7 landfill.

8 This will be just more of a vegetative
9 channel at the base of the landfill where we have steep
10 slopes. We're going to have to protect that face.

11 We haven't worked out the details of it,
12 but the water moves too fast on the base because we have
13 just a vegetative channel on surface.

14 We will also have a smaller channel on the
15 eastern side which can take water and varied at some
16 point where needed, and it will also come down the face.

17 And it will all discharge at the toe of the
18 landfill at one or two locations depending on the -- on
19 the best matching of the future plans in the area.

20 We're designing for two percent slope on
21 the top for our remediation project. That's not to
22 enhance gradient, but reduce the chance of infiltration.

23 This -- so we have -- I'll show you some
24 details down the road, what the surface channel looks
25 like and what the -- and what the cover system

1 alternatives look like.

2 One thing to note right now, this is a very
3 linear feature. What we've done since this is we --
4 we're not going to show the FS RAP, which will be in the
5 design. We're pushing this channel up against the
6 western slope here.

7 It will be more natural and will kind of
8 follow the old ballfield, the slope and not be a straight
9 shot.

10 Yeah.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Is your preference to
12 take some questions as we go or leave it to the end?

13 MR. HUNT: I'm okay. If you have a
14 question, go ahead.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I think you're
16 starting to get at it with the idea of something not
17 quite so linear, given that it's an actual park and part
18 of a restoration project.

19 Would there be the opportunity for maybe a
20 little velocity in that channel?

21 MR. HUNT: By pushing it up against the
22 western side, it has to actually follow the slope that's
23 out there now. The grades are going to change and some
24 portions go up, some portions go down. We'll fit that
25 therein, but the most recent concepts that we have are

1 much more sinuous than what you see here.

2 It has to -- there's a very dual purpose.

3 One, yes, we want it to look for natural. But the more
4 sinuous it is, we still have to get the water off of the
5 surface, so there's a balance that we have.

6 MR. BERMAN: You maybe already talked
7 about this, but can you say a little bit what the medium
8 is for moving the water?

9 MR. HUNT: For the -- for the most part,
10 it's an open -- open swale. We're -- we don't know what
11 the configuration will be. Right now, we're showing it
12 as a trapezoidal two foot by three. That's an efficient
13 way of carrying the water.

14 But the intent is anywhere that we can --
15 where the slopes are flat off, if we can have a
16 vegetative channel, we will. And most of the flow is on
17 this western side.

18 There are -- there are going to be a couple
19 places where it crosses under a future path; for example,
20 where it's going to have to go into a culvert and be
21 buried.

22 On the face of the landfill, we're looking
23 at options right now for what kind of way we can make it
24 to make sure there's no erosion on the
25 landfill base.

1 MR. BERMAN: In the bottom of this trough
2 that's moving along, is it compacted soil or is it
3 concrete that actually -- the shape, content, et cetera?

4 MR. HUNT: Yeah. Well, so we don't have a
5 final in that area, but the -- at present, it's -- it's
6 soil with -- and it will be -- we'll have -- when we
7 first build it, a lot of it will be soil.

8 We have to put down some erosion resistant
9 material, a turf blanket until we can establish what goes
10 in there, but until it gets steeper, yes.

11 I don't anticipate it getting steeper until
12 somewhere up here near the gate in that vicinity where we
13 have to start dipping it down and having something other
14 than vegetative channel there.

15 There's a -- on the eastern side, we
16 have -- we may have smaller with much less flow, a
17 smaller concrete channel, four, five feet just to get the
18 water out.

19 We're much more constrained with that space
20 that we have to work with, but that's carrying a small
21 enough flow in a narrow path. But almost everything is
22 on the western side.

23 MR. BERMAN: When you go with the
24 vegetative drainage, there's a tendency for the water to
25 find its own way, so to speak, where on the eastern

1 slope, where you're going to use concrete, you've got
2 control of the flow.

3 So presumably the design that you're
4 considering somehow may look good, may not take the water
5 where you want it to go.

6 MR. HUNT: We have to design the channel with
7 sufficient depth so that the water should stay in place
8 and covered with the maintenance component. So we can do
9 things to design it for our -- for the flow velocities we
10 expect --

11 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm.

12 MR. HUNT: -- but if there's problems, we
13 have to come in and maintain that to make sure it stays
14 where we want it to stay.

15 MR. BERMAN: So, I mean, to that extent,
16 there really is no final decision until water starts
17 flowing for a few years and you see that it works.

18 MR. HUNT: Well, so if we're designing for
19 a hundred-year storm event, most of the time we're not
20 going to have the hundred-year storm event, although in
21 Hawaii, we have -- we have a project in Hawaii, we've had
22 200-year storm events back to back.

23 But, you know, the hundred-year storm is a
24 statistical number.

25 So we have -- within that, we expect that

1 on the average here, you'll have less than that flow
2 event and you will have -- within the channel, there will
3 be certain paths that you may see and the water may take
4 preference.

5 But we need to maintain it and keep it
6 flowing. I don't expect that it's going to jump the
7 banks in any way and find a threshold in the channel.

8 MR. BERMAN: It's just that the cost of
9 doing that, when you consider maintenance, presumably
10 that's something that you will need to know.

11 MR. HUNT: Maintenance is an important
12 component.

13 MR. BERMAN: Thank you.

14 MR. HUNT: Anyone else?

15 Okay. This is the preliminary channel laid
16 out that is within the FS ramp. It is not pushed to the
17 western side. It is before we had some meetings with
18 Planning and the Natural Resources. So the concept will
19 change as we move forward.

20 The basic intent here of our channel is to
21 get the water off, analyze infiltration, and we want to
22 be able to vegetate while in there.

23 So we're working through the thicknesses of
24 fill material that we may be bringing here, the location
25 of the channel, the steepness of it.

1 One of the things that we have said in
2 our -- regardless of the cover system we pick, we intend
3 to -- to line underneath that channel, because it's where
4 you would have -- where water is going to concentrate on
5 top of landfill. So we want to have some extra
6 protection for infiltration in that channel.

7 So where that channel sits on top of
8 landfill, we're going to put in a little extra protection
9 to keep the water from infiltrating. So a plastic sheet,
10 essentially, that will sit under that channel.

11 These details will change as we go forward,
12 but the feasibility study will study the elements, and
13 take the elements down.

14 MR. BERMAN: I want to ask about the
15 materials. This lining that you're putting there has a
16 finite lifetime.

17 MR. HUNT: Everything has a finite
18 lifetime. You know, it's the same kind of membrane that
19 we put under municipal solid waste landfills and on the
20 top of municipal solid waste landfills.

21 It's a high density polyethylene. Sixty
22 mils, which is -- for plastic, it's thick.

23 MR. BERMAN: What's the manufacturer
24 claiming?

25 MR. HUNT: For an application like this,

1 they'll claim a thousand years. The devil's in the
2 details.

3 Whenever you put in a membrane like this,
4 you need to have people out there observing that
5 installation. They bring out channels, big rolls and
6 they'll have to cut them to fit.

7 Then they'll have to seam them, weld the
8 panels together. They'll have to have controls in the
9 manufacturing plant.

10 So there's a lot of this stuff out there.

11 MR. BERMAN: The membrane is a thousand
12 years, but with all the seams --

13 MR. HUNT: They're supposed to -- they're
14 made out of the same material. They shouldn't degrade
15 any faster than the membrane itself, but they have to be
16 built well and they have to be verified.

17 MS. FANELLI: Just to point out, this is
18 the same material that we placed in the storm water DSCs
19 in the top of the landfill 10. It will be similar type
20 of material.

21 MR. BERMAN: Isn't this a little steeper?

22 MS. FANELLI: No. They had -- what's your
23 grade? What's your percent grade here? We had a four
24 percent grade at -- so it's probably about the same.

25 If you look at the parking lot and how the

1 DNTs are -- they have a grade. But it's a good I thought
2 three or four percent. I'd have to check. I don't think
3 it's much different.

4 MR. HUNT: I was passing a sample. It's a
5 sample of plastic sheet.

6 MS. BLUM: I wonder if you'd be kind
7 enough to read over on the right-hand side the writing
8 there.

9 MR. HUNT: This says -- this is one of
10 these -- this says: "24 inches minimum engineered soil,"
11 which is two foot, a two foot cap.

12 That's one of the things we're working
13 through right now in terms of what that final thickness
14 will be in the channel.

15 This is a twelve inch minimum foundation
16 layer. That's where we go in. We're going to re-create
17 the landfill and we're going to compact at least the
18 upper foot of that material, make it a firm base to put
19 the rubber soles on top off of. That's the foundation
20 there.

21 Then we have a geocomposite drainage net.
22 If we've got water sitting in the channel and we put this
23 memory on there, and there will be some infiltration of
24 water in the soil if the water is moving slow enough that
25 we have a big drainage layer. The water will flow

1 through the drainage layer.

2 Then we have a geomembrane, which is what
3 we were just talking about. We have a landfill gas
4 collection. That's another drainage element to capture
5 gas coming up.

6 It's the same kind of material that's
7 usually on the top. In this case, it's to capture gas.
8 So it's all by the composite.

9 So this is specific to one of the cover
10 alternatives that we were talking about reviewing. The
11 details are going to change.

12 The concept of the channel with three
13 more -- some lining underneath it and the potential for
14 infiltration, yeah.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: You mentioned a few
16 times that the details will change.

17 MR. HUNT: Yeah.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: That everything's in
19 flux. It would be really great to be part of the
20 conversation so we're along with you along the way to see
21 what's being considered here and the reasons that you
22 make changes. That would give us a lot more ownership in
23 how the project evolves.

24 I'm not sure how you would like to bring us
25 along, but I guess I'm encouraging you to continue to

1 share with us the latest so we can kind of go along with
2 you as it evolves as you do pieces of it.

3 We had a meeting with natural resources and
4 they suggested this. It would be better for us to feel
5 that as we go along.

6 MR. HUNT: We're working with the Trust
7 right now. I'm sure --

8 MS. FANELLI: I know they have been
9 working with the project manager and we're trying to
10 develop that plan for this schedule to go out and how we
11 move from the FS RAP into design and make sure that
12 people are aware of how it's progressing.

13 I understand the need for schedule, the
14 need for planning so that there's some exchange of
15 information on that.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the reasons that
17 I bring that up is we went through a similar process with
18 landfill 10 where I think we talked about it a long time.

19 We were going to move some material up on
20 the top of the pumping area, and I don't recall that we
21 ever really had a visual of what that was going to look
22 like, and now my feeling of looking at that site is it's
23 much more massive than I would have expected.

24 It's kind of taller and built up higher,
25 and that's something that surprised me in the final look

1 of it.

2 So I think you would get some great input
3 if we could visualize some of the design concepts and
4 make it the best possible project. We can just share our
5 ideas with you and hopefully make it better.

6 MR. HUNT: We're working with the Trust on
7 the site. When the best point is for presenting all the
8 concepts that we go through --

9 MS. FANELLI: We're not into formal design
10 yet. We're still working on the concepts. We have to
11 get this RAP out because that's really the first step
12 before we start committing.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm totally under-
14 standing. And I'm just putting it out there that as --
15 we're interested in what the design is.

16 That really counts. These are very
17 important details to many people. So I appreciate your
18 having that conversation.

19 MR. HULTGREN: I don't think the contact
20 needs to be between the -- I guess Geosyntech Consultants
21 and the RAB. We're not engineers. We're not hired as
22 engineers.

23 The contact would be between the Trust and
24 the RAB. Geosyntech and the consultants would be in
25 contact with the Trust, and that is the appropriate

1 procedure; not that we're going to sit down with the
2 consultants and act as them. That's not appropriate.

3 MS. FANELLI: I agree that the contact
4 should be with us and we are working on getting our
5 internal house in order and understanding what that long-
6 term vision is.

7 It certainly has been something that's been
8 talked about internally so that we can share it and that
9 it becomes very clear where remediation and how the
10 remediation will leave the site and prepare the site for
11 those future land developments, because there will be
12 developments after mediation is complete and time for
13 that other consideration and discussion.

14 MS. KRAMER: I think it would be helpful
15 to know, too, when the final -- when you may be getting
16 the final design and who you're speaking with so that we
17 can some point along that way at the beginning, we sort
18 of have an understanding through the Trust of where all
19 this -- you know, what you are looking at or how you
20 narrow it down rather than coming in at the end and "this
21 is what we're doing."

22 Even if it's coming through you, but then
23 also what the rough timeline would be, because you don't
24 know when you're hoping to start construction and then
25 working back from there.

1 MS. FANELLI: We do, and your point is
2 well taken. Actually, we have a slide at the end that
3 talks about next steps.

4 Maybe we can talk about that and get
5 through a little bit more of the -- sort of what's going
6 to be in, what you're going to see in this RAP and then
7 I'd be happy to talk about at least what our hope is
8 scheduling and timing, we can talk about outreach and
9 discussions with the RAB at that point.

10 MR. HUNT: Some Of the recent data that we
11 collected in our investigation last summer, we're looking
12 at depths of fill material along the channel alignment,
13 and then we took all of the -- we have a few additional
14 points that we've collected in our investigation. We
15 took that to evaluate to evaluate the thickness of the
16 material.

17 These are all approximate. You can see the
18 spread of the data, but these are contour lines of
19 thickness of landfill material.

20 It's all based on these -- on these points
21 and it's based on there being no material on the
22 boundary, and we go through the system and we come up
23 with something that looks like this.

24 This is thickness, so what you're seeing
25 is -- when you see funny squiggles like this, what you

1 have to keep in mind is there's surface topography out
2 here.

3 If I have a bump on the circuit, that the
4 bottom of my waste may be fairly uniform down here. I'm
5 going to be thicker material hopefully in that spot. So
6 it looks somewhat regular.

7 This is something based on the data, and we
8 estimate we have about ten feet of landfill material. At
9 this point, we have our twenty foot contour. Our next
10 data found out here is ten, and here -- there's a lot of
11 potential variability out here.

12 One of the reasons we were looking at this
13 is to determine how much fill material will be on the
14 western site and how much material back here in the
15 historic forest.

16 And, you know, our deepest landfill
17 material up near the crested slope as kind of the
18 underlying -- the old channel goes down to the northeast
19 and the landfill came up and the thickest waste.

20 So this is the -- when we're trying to make
21 estimates of how much material that we need in this
22 project, we prefer this approach. Any new data point
23 that gives us any information on thicknesses, we go
24 through this process.

25 MS. CHEEVER: I was going to ask. Do I

1 see the numbers of 37 potential sections?

2 MR. HUNT: Yes. We have a 39 and a 37
3 over here. I think our maximum thickness is up to forty
4 feet. More than 35, which is the contour that we show.
5 We haven't measured it completely yet.

6 MR. BERMAN: Just for orientation, where
7 is Pop Hicks Field?

8 MR. HUNT: That's back here. The fence
9 line wrapped around over here. So this is the oldest
10 landfill material out here and I think Pop Hicks Field is
11 here, and then filling in after the field up to the end
12 of the landfill sometime around the 1970s to the north.

13 Okay.

14 MR. BERMAN: What's the estimation again
15 where the -- what the natural depth is at the deepest
16 point?

17 MR. HUNT: The deepest point we -- we've
18 measured in a boring is about 39 feet, and it's plus or
19 minus a few feet. But not too far from that.

20 MR. BERMAN: And can you refresh me? How
21 many -- was it groundwater below that?

22 MR. HUNT: Groundwater varies under the
23 landfill. Maybe John can talk about that.

24 MR. FORTUNA: The deepest part of the
25 landfill is about ten, fifteen feet below the bottom

1 before we contact any material.

2 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm.

3 MR. FORTUNA: Year-round, fluctuations in
4 the regional groundwater table are pretty small. They're
5 on the order of about half a foot. They're not affected
6 very much by rainfall.

7 MR. BERMAN: So you're confident pretty
8 much looking at in that it's unlikely to be much of a
9 connection between groundwater and the filters.

10 MR. FORTUNA: The landfill materials are
11 non-contact with the regional groundwater table. The
12 current situation with landfill E, which I talked about a
13 little bit last time, there is a lot of surface water
14 input into the filters that can result in purged water
15 table conditions, and that water can contact with waste
16 and it potentially percolates.

17 We haven't seen those impacts in the
18 monitoring program, and we're -- we'll eliminate those
19 surface water inputs into the landfill material.

20 MR. BERMAN: So you expect to have no
21 surface water infiltration?

22 MR. FORTUNA: That's my indication, yes.

23 MS. BLUM: Will these methods make any
24 change in the water to deal with conditions?

25 MR. HUNT: Up here where the elevations --

1 I think most of the climate change issues are going to be
2 at sea level.

3 MS. BLUM: Well, warming or --

4 MR. HUNT: True.

5 MS. BLUM: I don't know what's going to
6 happen. I was hoping you have a crystal ball.

7 MR. HUNT: This land if I'm not mistaken
8 is in a relatively small watershed. There isn't a ton of
9 water that's heading and creating the groundwater level
10 down here.

11 At current levels, but -- so I wouldn't
12 anticipate a significant rise in the water level under
13 landfill E.

14 MS. BLUM: I'm thinking of heavy
15 rainfalls.

16 MS. FANELLI: I think the impact we would
17 have is designed storm events and your channel was
18 undersized. This is being sized right now to be able to
19 convey the hundred-year -- how many hour or power per
20 hour.

21 In thirty years, forty years, if that
22 changed drastically, it might mean modifying the design
23 of the channel if we have that time in the future, to
24 change our flow if we found that water was overflowing
25 its banks.

1 MS. TSUJI: We make certain to plan for a
2 problem, and there is also a complimentary operation and
3 maintenance plan where there's annual periodic
4 inspections?

5 Every five years, they have to look back at
6 the previous five years to see is the remedy, the cap
7 functioning as planned.

8 And so if we moved it back to a five years
9 level to see have there been any changes, and that may
10 even be if new technology and your understanding the
11 science, we may have to go back and knock on the Trust
12 door saying we have new technology and we need to look at
13 what the cleanup entails ten years from now fifteen years
14 ago.

15 When we have looked at projects and we were
16 looking at contaminated groundwater, we use the
17 technology available that day, and that was the state of
18 the art.

19 By the time the late '90s came around,
20 engineering and technology had moved forward. So there
21 was new technology to be able to implement, and we went
22 back to the responsible party.

23 It's not really cost-effective, but we take
24 time to evaluate the cleanup solution and be more
25 aggressive.

1 But during the five-year reviews, we can
2 take a look at that.

3 MS. BLUM: Is there any way to measure the
4 effectiveness of your permeable layers and how they're
5 functioning?

6 MS. FANELLI: In terms of water?

7 MS. BLUM: Cap in place. Are there any
8 techniques to evaluate how it's functioning or not
9 functioning?

10 MS. FANELLI: We'll probably go in with
11 inspection of the cover. There's requirements of
12 settlement, differential settlement.

13 As they go forward, we'll see that there's
14 also requirements to look at landfill gas monitoring at
15 the system.

16 There's various aspects of the closure that
17 will be included in this monitoring.

18 MS. BLUM: Is DTSC the one that -- if
19 there's a change in the way that the best management
20 practices are managed, are you the one that rings the
21 bell with the Trust and says we have to look at the
22 system again or is it -- how does that work?

23 MS. TSUJI: The five-year.

24 MS. BLUM: Just the bottom line.

25 MS. TSUJI: We get an outline as to what

1 they're going. Once the report comes in, if we need to
2 review it for approval, we will, but if we feel -- if the
3 report comes in with recommendations, recommendations may
4 say that the remedy is still active, it's still operating
5 and taking care of business.

6 We may say we really need to beef up the
7 monitoring in this park for data.

8 It's site specific, but there are times we
9 get a report and we'll begin evaluation of the raw data.
10 We may say, "Your recommendation is not acceptable," and
11 we start talking to each other.

12 MR. HUNT: Landfill gas data. The
13 information, everything except for these green points is
14 information that we collected last summer which already
15 existed. There's six data points, one, two, three four,
16 five and six which have these little -- kind of diamond
17 shape indicators.

18 The -- those are from 1996, I think, from
19 like -- yeah. 1996 Montgomery Watson. So that was the
20 first landfill gas evaluation out here that went and
21 collected shallow landfill gas.

22 They went down five feet, I think, and they
23 found that -- you can't see it. This is less than .01.
24 This is percent methane.

25 So essentially no methane here, none here,

1 none up there. A .36 percent here, and they found up to
2 6.6 percent at this location here.

3 When the EKI did an investigation in 2002,
4 they came in and put another well in the grass probe.
5 Now they put one where they measured it ten feet below
6 and 25 feet below.

7 They wanted put it here because they wanted
8 to verify that that old data was, in fact, correct, and
9 they did find at the shallow depth, seven percent
10 methane.

11 So indeed this 6.6 was probably real, and
12 they put a couple probes along the perimeter along Quarry
13 Road and found essentially none, less than .1 percent
14 methane on the perimeter there.

15 We came in last summer, and based on
16 actually -- it won't match up quite exactly, but based on
17 sort of our review of the topography out there, if I were
18 natural gas and I was going to find another place where I
19 would collect, it would be in this place here.

20 So we put another probe in that area, and
21 we found almost thirteen percent methane in the landfill
22 there, a depth between five and ten feet below ground.

23 So you have basically a screen interval,
24 you have a well that's got slotted PVC where the air can
25 get in over that five foot range. We send it back to the

1 lap and we got a thirteen percent methane.

2 So we do have some -- some gas within the
3 landfill. We then followed that on in September and we
4 put in -- because all the investigations of the perimeter
5 have been on this side and below Quarry Road, we put in
6 perimeter probes on the south, on the west and at the toe
7 of the landfill, and each one of those cases, we didn't
8 find anything on the perimeter.

9 So consistent with these guys over here, we
10 also didn't find methane here or there on the western
11 toe.

12 This is a very old landfill. Methane
13 usually peaks out around the time that the landfill is --
14 is closed, within a few years of closure of the landfill.

15 There hasn't been any waste since 1970 or
16 so, so we really -- there is still methane in there. If
17 we did a surface stand on the landfill, two inches above
18 the ground on twenty foot intervals, it might be coming
19 it from the surface, but we decided because there was
20 methane in here, because we don't have a mal cover on top
21 of the landfill, this methane has been dissipating for
22 years and worked its way to the surface, it oxidizes and
23 the methane -- which is why we don't see methane on the
24 surface and it's not following to the perimeter.

25 Whatever our closure design is, we don't

1 want to impede the methane from coming out.

2 Sometimes if you put cap over landfill, any
3 methane that was coming up with new leaks will go out
4 sideways and then you see a problem in the perimeter.

5 This is very old landfill. It's not a
6 municipal solid waste landfill. It's got to breathe. It
7 does have some areas. We probably have organics in
8 there, something that's been there for forty, fifty
9 years. So there is still methane being generated.

10 Let's put a gas collection system in here
11 to allow the gas to come to the surface, and then that --
12 when I showed that surface detail, that was the geo-
13 deposit layer that was underneath the membrane.

14 Actually, that one goes over almost the
15 entire surface of the landfill, and -- and its goal is to
16 let the methane continue to come out at these very --
17 it's not coming out at thirteen percent.

18 They're not accepting it at the surface.
19 We don't anticipate seeing it at the surface. But to let
20 it do its thing rather than trap it.

21 MS. BLUM: If this is going to be a
22 ballfield playing, what is the risk of their health? Or
23 somebody smoking a cigarette and watching a child slide?
24 I'm sure you're taking that into consideration.

25 MR. HUNT: So we aren't doing --

1 Geosyntech is not doing an evaluation of the risk is this
2 much. We're -- we're putting in the collection system.

3 We're evaluating if we collect it and we
4 vent it, how high up in the air do we vent it so the
5 concentration and the breathing of it would be where
6 people might come in contact with it.

7 If we take a conservative estimate and we
8 design a system where we have X number of points above
9 the landfill, how high do we put that vent, if there is
10 gas out there.

11 So we're taking conservative estimates.
12 I'm going to evaluate it as if there was a lot more
13 methane producing than we think there is.

14 Now I bring that up the vent, and if it
15 comes out a vent at a certain concentration, by the time
16 we get down to where somebody might be breathing it,
17 what's that concentration going to be.

18 And I think by taking a conservative design
19 approach, this -- we were talking about this a little bit
20 earlier.

21 This landfill is at its peak generation, it
22 will be in the middle of its peak use period. We don't
23 know all the details.

24 So --

25 MS. FANELLI: This was a technical answer.

1 Let me try. We don't -- there's no measurable methane
2 anywhere in the region of the landfill.

3 When we put in the collection system, there
4 will be no measurable methane anywhere it. So it will be
5 engineered. It will be oversized to make sure that
6 when it's vented, it doesn't produce risk, and I presume
7 there's lots of different calculations that they go
8 through that will be included in the design engineering
9 documents to support the design, the design documents
10 that will be reviewed by DTSC and others in the RAP.

11 MS. SEGAL: I have a question.

12 MR. HUNT: Sure.

13 MS. SEGAL: On your most recent gas probe,
14 the one with thirteen percent, which is a bit higher than
15 the historic, that doesn't match the historic probe
16 numbers, thirteen percent.

17 That was in the top --

18 MR. HUNT: Can I tell why that -- I don't
19 know what is down there five to ten feet below at that
20 point that is still producing the methane now over fifty
21 years.

22 MS. SEGAL: It doesn't dissipate, that one
23 number. It peaked higher than the historic 2003 and
24 1998 --

25 MR. HUNT: Well, when methane is generated

1 in the landfill. When you have fresh municipal solid
2 waste and the reaction goes on, produces methane and
3 carbon dioxide in about 50/50 -- fifty percent methane
4 and fifty percent carbon dioxide and they kind of drown
5 out the other components of the air, nitrogen and oxygen,
6 those other elements. Actually, oxygen has to be gone.

7 So the fact that we're down at thirteen
8 percent methane in here that within that five foot screen
9 interval, we've got something that's producing methane.
10 It's probably producing fifty percent methane and fifty
11 percent carbon dioxide.

12 So where in that zone and what it is that's
13 producing it, the organics that are still decomposing,
14 what is producing it, I don't know.

15 The concentrations, the fact that we're not
16 getting methane at the perimeter, the fact that when we
17 did the surface screen, we didn't see anything coming out
18 of the surface, and just the knowledge that we are forty
19 years out is why we think that the risks are very low,
20 but we still want to have it vent to continue to decay.

21 MS. SEGAL: I was just wondering about the
22 higher number, because as time goes on, it keeps
23 decomposing.

24 MS. FANELLI: Your question is really
25 about distribution, because there was never a previous

1 measurement in the location where we got the thirteen.

2 So there is some variability in gas
3 throughout the landfill depending on where the organics
4 are located, what pocket is the gas generated.

5 So I guess the thirteen we would probably
6 postulate was always there. We just didn't have a well
7 in that location.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Can you describe a
9 little bit in how the membrane collects the gas? Is it
10 just floating up or is there suction or vacuum?

11 MR. HUNT: We're proposing to start with a
12 passive system where we would have this -- a --

13 MS. SEGAL: Is your question about the
14 methane collection system?

15 MR. HUNT: I'll pass this around. This is
16 a geo net. It's polyethylene plastic. It's got two sets
17 of ribs going in different directions, and what it does,
18 it creates a way for water or gas to flow through it.

19 And this is a geo composite. It's a net
20 which is surrounded by two filter -- two pieces of filter
21 fabric and this keeps the soil from getting into the net.

22 We can use this as a drainage layer, water
23 comes in and flows into the net, gas finds the easiest
24 path out, and we'll have to design for the appropriate
25 thickness and have some factors of safety in which we

1 select the weight.

2 So this kind of material will be spread
3 over the vast majority of the cover, and we're really
4 trying to provide a pathway out.

5 We're going to allow it to come up, get
6 through the net and get to the nearest vent.

7 We probably have sort of a gravel pit
8 surrounded by the fabric where this becomes a collection
9 point and a pipe that comes out of the surface and it's
10 going to be ten feet, twelve feet.

11 We haven't figured out the exact height,
12 but we'll have these based around the site at places
13 where we can still meet the entrance requirement of the
14 site so that it's not sitting in the middle of a future
15 ballfield.

16 But -- and I expect that that's going to be
17 enough. The volume of gas should be fairly small.

18 At the same time, if in the monitoring
19 program we should see something, we see detection at the
20 perimeter or we see that a gas is coming up somewhere, we
21 can then go to those vents; we can shut some of them
22 down; we can apply vacuums to some of them and actually
23 control where that has to go.

24 So we don't anticipate going to an active
25 system. But we want to design them so that if we have to

1 put in a switch, we can.

2 I can pass these around.

3 MR. BERMAN: The vacuums will be located
4 near vents?

5 MS. FANELLI: Not necessarily. I think
6 the engineering, however those vents, whether it's
7 suction, will be located where it fits with the future
8 land use, but it's piped and plumbed appropriately so
9 that it functions as designed.

10 MR. BERMAN: Besides the vent pipes is
11 something that's permanently sitting out there, you stick
12 a hose in it.

13 MS. FANELLI: For an active system?

14 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

15 MS. FANELLI: It would be active until
16 such time that the gas dissipated entirely. I don't know
17 how long that would be.

18 MR. HUNT: We haven't gone through the
19 exercise of deciding how much of the active
20 infrastructure. We want to make sure that we can control
21 those vents opened and closed.

22 We haven't decided do we want to go in and
23 decide here is where we will put this or something that's
24 going to suck on this system or whether we want to do
25 that if there's a problem down the road, we do some

1 trenching.

2 We want to make sure that any retrofit we
3 do out there will be pretty minimal.

4 MR. BERMAN: So there is some kind of
5 monitoring of gas?

6 MS. FANELLI: There will probably be other
7 monitoring points throughout the area.

8 MR. BERMAN: It's just kind of a cosmetic
9 question as to whether any portions of an active system
10 are going to be visible along the drainage.

11 They're right on the border, and presuming
12 you don't need it everywhere, but there could be some
13 underneath the slope and gathering what's there.

14 MR. HUNT: You know, you can -- there are
15 many levels of active system. One can go to a minimum
16 level like on an outhouse, those things that spin and
17 create some suction.

18 What level we go to would depend on what
19 the -- what the concentrations were, how much we thought
20 we needed to pull.

21 Anyway, if we found -- you know, if we
22 found some gas in one part, we would, you know, only put
23 a vacuum in that area. We don't want to overdo it, but
24 we don't anticipate that we're going to have to do that.

25 MR. BERMAN: Can you model what you think

1 the landfill is that would produce things like this
2 thirteen percent number? Is it some kind of primitive
3 model what the materials are?

4 MR. HUNT: There are -- and this is one
5 thing that we're doing. There are landfill gas
6 generations. They're not designed to say I've got
7 fifteen percent methane in this location in the landfill.

8 They tend to be -- they're designed to say
9 the total methane production in the landfill after forty
10 years is going to be no more than this amount or
11 depending what the input of the model are.

12 And so it would be -- it's very difficult
13 to tie that in concentrations we see in here in these few
14 locations, but we certainly can -- we can run
15 conservative models which is an upper bound on how much
16 gas we're going to have to deal with.

17 MR. BERMAN: I guess the question is
18 really do you estimate how much -- what's the max or the
19 value of that material that's producing the higher
20 numbers?

21 MR. HUNT: I -- we would have to do a lot
22 more, I think. I think this data is not particularly
23 suitable for estimating those kinds of volumes.

24 What we would have to do is go out from
25 there and do some fairly elaborate evaluations of volume

1 of flow as opposed to concentration, capture -- you have
2 to create a system in the field that was sunk into the
3 ground in a certain defined area and measure how much
4 flow is coming up, if at all, and we didn't see anything
5 coming off.

6 We don't think it makes sense to go down
7 that path trying to quantify it. We want to be
8 conservative on how much we predict.

9 MR. BERMAN: It's not that we don't
10 respect what you're doing. It's just that many of us
11 came from studying this hoping that the decision would be
12 a closure and the preferred is engineered cover, but
13 we're concerned with whatever's left in there and the
14 potential change.

15 All these questions are about a concern
16 from what was the hoped for solution to what is actually
17 going to occur, and because of that, we keep asking the
18 questions, which are basically driven by our concern for
19 what's being left there, and as a community organization,
20 this is -- we would have some responsibility -- at least
21 we feel we have some responsibility to be sure with
22 whatever remedy is finally chosen that it makes sense in
23 the long-term stability of that particular area.

24 So it's not a criticism. It's just that we
25 have always felt that the preferred alternative was the

1 closure, and now when it's not, there's always these
2 questions that keep popping up, which is the eventual
3 outcome for everything that's in there.

4 MR. HUNT: I understand. These are part
5 of the process. Hydrogeology, the groundwater
6 conditions, the surface water that's going into the pipe
7 in the landfill, which is going to be removed as part of
8 the process.

9 That discussion is in the FS -- is in the
10 FS RAP. We're not repeat repeating it here.

11 The geotechnical stuff, the seismic
12 evaluations, settlement, all of those that I'm confident
13 as a geotechnical engineer that we can design these at
14 three to one slopes.

15 We have done some preliminary evaluations.
16 That's going to go into the design document and you will
17 not see that in the FS RAP.

18 Yes.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Would the geotechnical
20 review also include this scenario, that under similar
21 circumstances, I imagine that there may be a clay layer
22 at base that could, you know, perhaps be a slide plane
23 for deformation of the landfill or seismic event?

24 MR. HUNT: I can tell you from the
25 investigation we did, we put a boring in the center

1 landfill which worked out to be based on the topography
2 about center of the old channel, pre-landfill channel.

3 We put a boring in at the toe about the
4 landfill channel and we did find clay material down
5 there.

6 We don't -- we step off from that not very
7 far and it doesn't -- we won't see it, but I expect it's
8 more of a channel that may be has some sediment deposit
9 in there.

10 But we are definitely evaluating that
11 cross-section from a stability standpoint and we've done
12 laboratory testing on that material. And so we're
13 looking at that.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

15 One question that comes to mind. If you
16 found such a layer that may have come from a creek
17 channel or spring or something, wouldn't that suggest
18 that there was groundwater at the surface?

19 MR. HUNT: I would think it would be
20 probably a surface water rather than a groundwater.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: But it could be
22 groundwater, surface water, an expression. I'm imagining
23 that --

24 MS. FANELLI: What's the question?

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, the question that

1 was asked a little earlier I think by Sam was the -- are
2 we seeing impacts from the groundwater to the material on
3 the landfill?

4 And it suggests we see regional groundwater
5 below the base of the fill and any other water will be
6 perched within the surface water that's coming through.

7 I'm just inquiring -- I don't think I can
8 look at that, at least speculate about the idea of a clay
9 layer and some channel.

10 I mean, that was present in that ravine.
11 That suggests maybe there was some surface water at the
12 base.

13 MR. HUNT: When I look at the location of
14 these, what I see is the western tributary coming down
15 that hill.

16 These are the old channel that came down
17 from the southwest corner. So if they're in a place that
18 there was water, I don't think it would seep necessarily.
19 I think it was the old channel coming down there.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. I just had a
21 similar experience in the other two tributaries in those
22 conditions.

23 MS. FANELLI: Again, elevation of the same
24 time.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: I don't know that it's

1 been really well-defined in all of those areas. I would
2 say the areas of fill, as I'm sure this site is, but if
3 you just look at the leaching, there's something coming
4 out from underneath Paul Goode Field and it's coming out
5 here.

6 There's El Polin Spring, so we get the
7 western tributary, could there be a spring?

8 MS. FANELLI: I better understand what
9 you're describing.

10 MR. BERMAN: Is that something for further
11 review?

12 MS. FANELLI: I guess now that I
13 understand the question a little bit more, we'll talk
14 about how to respond to it, and whether it's a spring or
15 an expression of still flow coming through a former
16 channel now filled with dirt, and I have a different
17 permeability with my fill soils and base soils.

18 I guess it's a spring in so much as it
19 exists, but if it's coming out from the underlying
20 bedrock into that fill or if it's still an expression of
21 infiltration higher up and that's how a contact where it
22 can discharge, that's where I'm not sure what the answer
23 is.

24 There are springs up above and we see them
25 in landfill 2 in particular coming out of the soil. So

1 there are springs that come out of the bedrock.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there trace elements to
3 groundwater that you will not expect to find?

4 MS. FANELLI: You can look at the
5 difference in water quality from surface and groundwater.
6 I suppose we could -- you could do that kind of study.

7 I have a question right now in the end, if
8 we had water quality impacts. That would be maybe
9 important to do.

10 I'm not sure that we have the same water
11 quality. We have water quality impacts that would
12 indicate that we should go to that level of analysis.

13 But I think there are some ways to look at
14 it, and trying to maybe understand what we see in these
15 channels is sort of an infiltration surface flow analysis
16 and discharging off the base of that fill.

17 That's why we see it in that context, as
18 opposed to what we see in landfill 2 if it's coming out
19 of the serpentinite now that we've taken all that fill
20 out and we can see that expression.

21 MR. BERMAN: My question is there should
22 be some landfill investigation of trace elements, and
23 you're arguing that there's no particular reason to do
24 that.

25 But we're all assuming that there is no

1 connection between the landfill and the groundwater.

2 MS. FANELLI: I understand that. I guess
3 I was proposing there's a difference in signatures
4 between the surface and groundwater. There may or may
5 not have a different signature. There could be a reason
6 to do that kind of analysis.

7 But the purpose of the analysis is I guess
8 what you're saying is you want some confirmation whether
9 or not there's discharge from the bedrock into the fill
10 soils and organics and material that make up that water.

11 MR. BERMAN: Well, I only feel that --
12 you're the one that's basing the decision on the
13 supposition that there's no connection between the
14 contamination in the groundwater.

15 At some future time, how is that confirmed?
16 Is there any specific experimentation or is it just based
17 on the -- on the -- the etiology of the area in terms of
18 area?

19 Again, you're taking responsibility
20 assuming there's no connection, so we should be
21 adequately sure that it isn't.

22 MS. FANELLI: I think there's a little
23 more. It's not that there's no connection. We're
24 looking at a cover alternative because we feel that it's
25 protective based on the fact that we don't see

1 significant impacts in water quality, and we know that at
2 this point surface water is in contact because we do have
3 a perched table, but we don't think there's water quality
4 impacts.

5 So in our determination, the alternatives
6 of looking at what improves that situation significantly
7 of taking that source of water from the waste and I
8 continue to monitor groundwater and I continue to see
9 little or no groundwater impacts, then I'm still going to
10 protect the human health and environment.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Perhaps one thing that
12 we could set this into a technical discussion that we
13 really can't resolve anything because we're not looking
14 at the data.

15 If you would be okay, that we could
16 actually at another meeting review the groundwater
17 data --

18 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: -- and ask some more
20 questions.

21 MR. FORTUNA: To be honest, one reason we
22 omitted it tonight, I knew it would be a complicated and
23 lengthy discussion that would probably take more time
24 than we have.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: We really appreciate

1 that if you'd just go through that.

2 MR. BERMAN: It's one of those sticky
3 issues.

4 MS. FANELLI: I just want it to be clear
5 that, you know, we're basing this -- you said we're
6 basing it on the case that there's no -- there's no
7 contact, and that's not a hundred percent -- the hundred
8 percent statement. It's not just on that. We understand
9 the uncertainty.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks for that.

11 MR. HUNT: That's what I've put up here.
12 So on the cover system, we have three -- three sub-
13 alternatives that we looked at for the feasibility study
14 document.

15 The first one is the engineered soil cover
16 in that we have our foundation layer soils. We then have
17 the landfill gas station, we have clay around, and above
18 that, we have 24 inches of clean soil.

19 We have the engineered clay cover where we
20 have foundation layer, the gas collection, and then we
21 have a foot of -- of a clay material that would have to
22 be the N to minus six centimeters requirement, and then
23 above that, we have a foot of -- this will be clean clay.
24 This will be clean soil on some of vegetative here.

25 The same two feet, but in this case, we

1 have a permeability layer in there.

2 And the third one is the engineering geo
3 synthetic cover, and that is where we have foundation
4 layer and we would have the gas collection layer.

5 Above that, we would have a geo synthetic
6 clay liner, which is a manufactured kind of permeability
7 layer.

8 It's a thinner, very, very low permeability
9 clay layer which takes the place of the particular
10 thicker clay and then a membrane on top of that and the
11 two feet of clean soil.

12 These are kind of -- the engineered soil
13 cover without the clean clay component, it's our
14 recommended, our preferred alternative.

15 These two are sort of traditional landfill
16 cover municipal solid waste landfill cover scenarios
17 where you have a foot of clay and a membrane, and this is
18 what you see for a municipal solid waste landfill when
19 you don't have a land on the bottom. This is what you
20 see when you do have a landfill model.

21 We looked at those three scenarios and this
22 is what we selected, what our preferred alternative would
23 be.

24 MS. CHEEVER: What are the things that
25 look almost like a half wheel coming out of the bottom?

1 Are those --

2 MR. HUNT: Are you talking about this
3 here?

4 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah.

5 MR. HUNT: It's just a representation that
6 there's material below. The landfill debris is just
7 different patterns.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Is it debris?

9 MR. HUNT: Landfill debris.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Those interesting samples
11 you passed out, where is the first one, the polyethylene?

12 MR. HUNT: So for all of the cover
13 alternatives, when we get to the stream channel, we put
14 that membrane in there.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Oh, in the stream channel.

16 MR. HUNT: But over the rest of the cover
17 system, that's only here, the geo membrane. You have two
18 feet of clean soil, then we have the membrane, which we
19 passed out, and then we have the composite.

20 You put the GCL, that's the sandwich that
21 we have, and that's what you often see -- it's a
22 municipal solid landfill bottom line.

23 MS. CHEEVER: But is that the only one
24 that has that?

25 MR. HUNT: That 3C is a geo synthetic

1 cover. That includes that sandwich material in there.
2 3B has a foot of clay in it. 3A does not have the clay,
3 but two feet of soil.

4 All of them have a landfill gas collection
5 there. We want to continue to vent this landfill. We
6 don't want to trap it and have it go somewhere where we
7 can't control it.

8 MR. KETCHAM: 3A is your preferred?

9 MR. HUNT: Yes. We're working with DTSC
10 to review and come up with what we have.

11 The rationale is that -- that groundwater
12 impact on the site we're not seeing that there's --

13 MR. FORTUNA: The real reason that you use
14 clay or geo composite in municipal solid waste landfill
15 is to prevent infiltration of moisture into the landfill,
16 which generates VJ that you have to deal with.

17 At this site, we have pretty high volumes
18 of surface water entering the landfill currently from a
19 variety of areas.

20 The details have not been worked out, and
21 we're investigating all of these sources as part of the
22 design.

23 So the reduction in the amount of water
24 that's entering the landfill, independent of the cap, is
25 going to be on the order of 95 percent. We don't have

1 calculation yet, but it's going to be a very high
2 percentage, and even with the amount of water that's in
3 there now.

4 By mitigating all of those infiltrations
5 and putting compacted soil layer on top, we're vastly
6 improving conditions over what they've been for the life
7 of the landfill.

8 So you know, we don't feel at the time that
9 we need to have a membrane.

10 MR. KETCHAM: And so 3A is good enough.
11 It's safe enough and it costs less than B and C?

12 MS. FANELLI: Actually, it doesn't cost
13 anything less than B, but it does have significant
14 benefits to future land development.

15 Membranes and clays are very difficult to
16 put structure on top of it, and it will create
17 infrastructure, amenities, but plants to put to
18 reestablish habitats or historic forests.

19 So in this case, it's not really a cost
20 issue, either. It's really a future land aspiration
21 development issue, and at the same time, we feel that it
22 is not slightly better or just as good. It's equally as
23 protective.

24 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

25 MS. FANELLI: I want to be really clear.

1 It's equally as protective as the other alternatives.

2 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

3 MS. BLUM: Are you going to excavate in
4 order to put down these materials or are you going to put
5 the materials on top of this landfill?

6 MR. HUNT: So the first thing, we will
7 re-create the landfill.

8 MS. BLUM: Great.

9 MR. HUNT: So it will be reshaped. Within
10 the waste footprint, the limit where we've seen landfill
11 material, we're going to reshape that landfill to enhance
12 drainage to create the right area for future land uses,
13 to create a three foot slope.

14 Right now it's steeper. We're going to
15 reshape that landfill.

16 Once we reshape it, so that foundation that
17 I talked about, below each option, there's re-created
18 landfill material, compacted to make it nice and firm so
19 we can build up from there.

20 Then we build up and we bring in the two
21 feet of soil on top of that, we bring the membrane and
22 the channel. We're going to bring in the landfill to
23 enhance drainage and the future.

24 MS. BLUM: When you regrade this landfill,
25 how deep do you think you'll have to go to regrade it?

1 MR. HUNT: For the most part, I have to
2 look and see.

3 MS. BLUM: My real question is: How far
4 away are you going to be from fill material when you
5 create the landfill?

6 I think one of those shadow spots there.

7 MR. HUNT: We're not going to be digging
8 down ten feet --

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MR. HUNT: -- in order to -- it may be by
11 regrading that ground perimeter, we may get close enough
12 to the material, and we're working through some of
13 this -- some of these scenarios with the Trust
14 departments to see -- in the forest zone, can we dig some
15 additional material out to allow for deeper roots for
16 that area.

17 In order to regrade the landfill, it's a
18 relatively shallow -- we may go a foot or two in some
19 areas and we may go a few in as much as we shape it.

20 MR. KETCHAM: So as far as the regrading
21 goes and the selection of the option for how you're going
22 to cap it, is it important for you to understand what
23 this site's going to look like when it's fully developed
24 coming out the other end? Does that have a bearing? Do
25 you understand yet what it's going to look at, what

1 field's going to be there? How large the field's going
2 to be, where the parking lot's going to be? All that
3 stuff.

4 MS. FANELLI: We don't have all those
5 details, but the Trust has been working internally to
6 make sure that we complete the remediation, that we have
7 provided the maximum flexibility in future developments
8 of the -- in particular the ballfield and the ballfield
9 amenities.

10 MR. KETCHAM: So you're confident that no
11 matter what the vision for the site is going to be, the
12 remediation will allow for that?

13 MS. FANELLI: That is the object. That is
14 definitely the goal, and the decisions, as far as I know,
15 have not been made on a lots of the design elements of
16 where things are going to go, because again those
17 elements are not necessarily the remediation elements,
18 and I think the Trust hasn't decided on what those
19 elements are.

20 We want to make sure that we're -- that our
21 remedial design doesn't preclude anything that could be
22 basically foreseeable.

23 MS. BLUM: I'm having a hard time
24 understanding that, because if you don't know what kind
25 of land is, I don't know how you can get there. It seems

1 very inverted logic of what you said.

2 If you don't know what the final result is
3 going to be of this area, how can you design?

4 MS. FANELLI: Well, we're not designing
5 the ballfield. We're designing the landfill.

6 MS. BLUM: But you have to make it
7 available for the end use, which is the ballfield.

8 MS. FANELLI: Right. The way that we
9 approach that -- it's really a design issue, but we try
10 to anticipate what the needs are going to be and then
11 provide for those kind of designs.

12 So, for example, we're going to give them a
13 nice firm foundation, and then the ballfield design is
14 done and they'll basically cover.

15 Whether it comes to issue of
16 infrastructure, whether we need to run more electrical
17 wire -- I don't think there are in that ballfield, but
18 say they needed to do so. We're doing that on the
19 landfill now and -- some of the things that we're talking
20 about in design and we're trying to accommodate either
21 build them a corridor so that they can put a sewer line
22 in that corridor or we'll have the plans in place so that
23 if they have to go back in and do a sewer line in the
24 future, how did he do it and the requirements will all be
25 outlined and agreed to with the department.

1 MR. KETCHAM: But what's the reason that
2 you wouldn't do it in the opposite sequence? Why would
3 you not come up with a design for the ultimate site, and
4 then do your remediation in a way that fits best within
5 that future plan?

6 MS. FANELLI: That would be ideal, but it
7 depends on funding at the time. Some of these park
8 projects with the Trust are before the remediation board,
9 if we talked about a deadline to get all those done so
10 that we can complete the programs, there is a chance that
11 we'd need to align our insurance, make sure that we're
12 able to access that policy and the benefits of that
13 policy. In some cases, that schedule may not coincide
14 exactly with the development plans.

15 So you're actually Right, Jim, it would be
16 nice to have them all in the right order.

17 MR. KETCHAM: But this has been something
18 that's been ten years; right? It's been known it's going
19 to be developed as a ballfield.

20 What's the area of the Presidio that is in
21 charge of deciding that ultimate design for the site? Is
22 that the Planning Department?

23 MS. FANELLI: Planning Department in
24 conjunction with the broader management team, which
25 includes the operations and maintenance manager.

1 MR. KETCHAM: So they're just deciding not
2 to decide right now?

3 MS. FANELLI: I wouldn't say they're
4 deciding not to decide. I would say with all of the
5 constraints and issues that they're facing, they're
6 trying to prioritize what they need to do.

7 That said, to the extent that we can make
8 sure when we do our design, it will accommodate the
9 aspirations; not only on future ballfield development,
10 but of trail developments, parking, the restoration of
11 creek channel and historic forest, which those last two
12 are a little bit easier for us to get at because we can
13 do some reforestation and do some planting.

14 We're trying to accommodate all of those.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Isn't one challenge that if
16 you start with the idea that there's going to be a
17 ballfield there, is that saying what the options are?
18 Could you even start planning the remediation knowing
19 that clean closure's not an option?

20 MS. FANELLI: I'm not understanding you.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Well, if you move land E
22 quick, it would be kind of hard to put a ballfield there,
23 wouldn't it? Because the slope would drain.

24 MS. FANELLI: It would require a different
25 grading plan for the ballfield, yes. At that point.

1 MS. CHEEVER: My point was you start --
2 assuming there's going to be a ballfield there, you
3 should consider clean closure; right?

4 MS. FANELLI: I would disagree with that.
5 You come up with what is protective of human health and
6 the environment, and if the data indicated it could not
7 be protective of human health and environment with the
8 cover, we would not be proposing that.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems to me that one
10 element of the ballfield that may have something to do
11 with the remediation plan would be what the surface would
12 be and whether it required irrigation or not, if it was a
13 natural field versus synthetic and that could have a
14 major impact on the cover, how you made it.

15 I don't know that for sure, but one thing I
16 do know is that whether it's municipalities or
17 educational institutions, they change their mind often
18 about their field.

19 Well, you have a synthetic field for ten
20 years, we don't like it anymore. We're going to go with
21 a natural field. Several years later, they're back to
22 synthetic.

23 It just seems like it would be prudent to
24 talk about that with respect to the design of the cover
25 could be flexible for those issues that might come up in

1 the future. So --

2 MS. FANELLI: I can tell you our design is
3 flexible regardless of the surface they put on it,
4 whether it is a grass surface or synthetic surface.

5 So we are looking at that, and that's one
6 of the areas of flexibility. How we deal with utilities
7 that might be in the cover is another thing that we're
8 looking at.

9 So when we're in design, we want to make
10 sure that we create flexibility so that those aspirations
11 can be achieved without having to go back and modify a
12 closure.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes. Exactly.

14 MR. HUNT: So we talked through those
15 bullet points.

16 MS. FANELLI: This is sort of our next
17 steps, and what we want to do is get this document out as
18 soon as possible, and Genevieve is the PM and she's
19 working with Virginia and we're trying to align our
20 schedules to come up with design and how we're going to
21 approach it.

22 So I do want to say that we are indeed
23 hoping and trying to make sure that we can construct in
24 this season. That means the design will be moving
25 forward as quickly as we can have it move forward, and we

1 are looking at ways of involving and procuring
2 contractors so that we can position ourselves, once we
3 have an approved design, to construct it as timely as we
4 can, and we're also trying to be mindful of the fact that
5 we don't have an approved RAP, and we first need to get
6 the department's review and approval of the RAP, but then
7 the design documents and not extend ourselves to too much
8 risk going forward.

9 I would like to see the design start in
10 earnest in the next couple of months while the review
11 process of the RAP is ongoing, and I am certainly not
12 opposed to suggestions as we go through our internal
13 design, maybe at punctuated intervals, schedule review
14 meetings that would allow the RAB and any other members
15 of the public that are interested to talk about it.

16 I guess Virginia will be taking some
17 direction and working with Radhika to come up with a plan
18 and the department.

19 MR. KETCHAM: What's the hoped for
20 timetable?

21 MS. FANELLI: I'm still hoping that we
22 will be in construction this summer.

23 MR. KETCHAM: And finish?

24 MS. FANELLI: Which means that we will be
25 taking some conceptual designs and doing some design

1 documents in March/April and hopefully getting final
2 approvals in the May time frame.

3 I may be crazy. That's aggressive, but I'm
4 hoping that we can find ways to keep our program moving
5 forward so that we can get basic construction started
6 this year.

7 MR. KETCHAM: And if it starts in the
8 summer, it might be finished by?

9 MS. FANELLI: We will be done like we
10 were -- as we were on the fillsite 1 and landfill 2.
11 There we did push it a little bit later, but we will be
12 done by September 30th.

13 So we will either have a plan that says
14 this is how far we're going to go this year and then
15 we're buttoning it up and then I have to depend on these
16 guys and the contractor to tell me what is a reasonable
17 way construction break and how would we winterize the
18 site like we winterized landfill 2.

19 We're working on those timelines and
20 documents and finishing that site up this coming year.

21 MR. KETCHAM: So landfill E probably won't
22 be completed at the end of 2011.

23 MS. FANELLI: I am hoping that the
24 remediation is substantially completed and that we're
25 into post --

1 MR. KETCHAM: Like the vegetation plan,
2 that kind of stuff, the same as fillsite 1, landfill 2.

3 MS. FANELLI: That was always on a two-
4 year. We're going to finish that up next year. My goal
5 is to have that done this year.

6 If it goes over to two years, it goes over
7 to two years, but that's -- that's moving forward.

8 MR. KETCHAM: It's okay for you to
9 continue to think crazy.

10 MS. FANELLI: We're trying really hard to
11 finding ways to work with the department to accelerate as
12 best we can.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Did you go over the
14 timeline?

15 MS. TSUJI: Maybe this is a good time for
16 the department to chime in here. Last month, it was like
17 the RAP would be out, and our staff to have an
18 opportunity at least to do a first cut review to be able
19 to come here tonight and have dialogue, but I didn't make
20 people come.

21 It sounds like maybe the next RAB meeting
22 on the 8th, I have some conflicts, because my engineer
23 and I need to be in Fort Bragg. So I'm trying to see if
24 I can have an engineer here.

25 He's also attending a public meeting up

1 there. It really kind of depends on when the department
2 is in receipt of the Draft RAP, or else come in for kind
3 of similar discussions tonight, hear from the RAB
4 members.

5 You know, we can have a separate study
6 session, which may really work out in timing, because I
7 also want to have the RAB members to have a chance to
8 look at this document, and we're kind of used to looking
9 at documents. We kind of go on auto pilot.

10 Then the department -- as the department
11 reviews and comments on the Draft RAP back to the Trust,
12 another draft may come in.

13 So we're hoping at that point in time, it
14 would be ready to begin the formal public comment period
15 where the department holds a public meeting to accept
16 public comments, written comments, and then shortly after
17 that time period, approve the RAP if it's ready to be
18 approved.

19 Based on comments, sometimes we have to go
20 back and work things out.

21 Typically what we do is as the document is
22 out, there is a comment period during the comment period,
23 and then the technical staff works with the parties to
24 start the design documents, so there isn't a holdup from
25 the thirty-day comment period, and then you have to wait

1 several weeks to see the design document.

2 We try to start at least front loading a
3 lot of the design elements now.

4 What the department has been doing is as
5 the Trust team is talking among the Trust personnel to
6 find out what is it ultimately they need. They've been
7 asking our engineer and Virginia questions like well, if
8 we do A, you know, we'll tell them we need this level of
9 detail in the document or they'll say something like
10 "well, we can do that, you have to do these things" so
11 that what we will get won't be totally off base, but we
12 have to get back to say this isn't going to work at all.

13 So they kind of have working knowledge of
14 what we look for in engineering concepts.

15 There is one where the methane gas -- I
16 know our engineers got excited when he saw some of the
17 numbers.

18 So through the dialogue, they got better
19 understanding of what the data was, where the data was
20 found onsite and they understood more.

21 In fact, the engineer was out today getting
22 familiar with landfill E. He was out with the person at
23 the Trust -- I can't say touching. Understanding what's
24 going on.

25 That's kind of how we're envisioning the

1 outreach, and because of the residents nearby, probably
2 we'll be doing outreach directly to them, perhaps in any
3 of the group meetings of one, matching a face with the
4 department so they can have a dialogue and if they have
5 any questions about what's going on.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I have a couple of
7 follow-up questions from last meeting. And it had to do
8 with the trees.

9 MS. TSUJI: I did do some research a
10 little bit. We have a couple staff people, one's a Ph.D.
11 botanist and the other is a Ph.D. soil scientist.

12 I kind of picked their brain, and they
13 didn't look at any of the data at the site, but they were
14 saying that eucalyptus trees, they tend to have a more
15 shallow root systems, not real deep, and the -- metals is
16 the main contaminant, and the root system is like our
17 skin.

18 It provides nutrients to the trees, but
19 then it also acts as a protective protection so that it
20 doesn't let things that shouldn't be taken up.

21 Metals are one thing that typically,
22 typically -- it's just a very general concept that they
23 shared is not usually something that's uptake, uptaken.
24 Is that the right word? Where the tree takes it in.

25 And then the metal -- metals would have to

1 be -- in nature, be mobile to get up into the plant
2 itself.

3 That said, they said if there were any --
4 the soil surrounding the root would have to be really
5 contaminated for an uptake to occur.

6 So if it's sporadic like it is here, part
7 of the root system may be touching the contamination,
8 part of it may not, but the likelihood that the tree
9 itself has contamination, it's unlikely.

10 We can get more in-depth analysis. That's
11 kind of just the overview, overview of plants and trees.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you feel like that
13 is enough for you, then, as far as the --

14 MS. TSUJI: I think from a project
15 standpoint, we feel comfortable with our current
16 situation.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: And the other question
18 we had was the work that is going on at the base of the
19 landfill, have you guys -- has DTSC been out to observe
20 that?

21 MS. TSUJI: Which?

22 FACILITATOR KERN: That's -- where all the
23 trees are.

24 MS. TSUJI: Yeah. I have been -- staff
25 has been periodically going out as the work has

1 progressed, in particular after a rain.

2 In fact, after one of the rains during the
3 Christmas holidays, I believe, we did get in touch and
4 addressing some concerns.

5 They are addressing kind of a spot. Then
6 we've been periodically going out and looking at the
7 progress.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Very good.
9 Thank you.

10 I will return back to my spot up here where
11 I can cram the other six sites in five minutes.

12 MS. FANELLI: Six sites?

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, whatever.

14 There are some other sites that we're
15 monitoring and trying to check in on, and one of them
16 that we've noticed some activity on is Mountain Lake. It
17 seems like there are some -- the legal issues may be kind
18 of closer for convergence with some settlement, perhaps.

19 Is there anything that you can talk to us
20 about?

21 MS. FANELLI: I believe we're close to
22 settlement with Zurich. I don't know if it's finalized
23 or not, but it looks like that will be successfully
24 concluded.

25 I will be treating Mountain Lake as a known

1 site and moving forward.

2 So that said, we are ramping up to get that
3 RAP moving forward, and Genevieve is the project manager.
4 Medi --

5 MS. TSUJI: Yes, she's back.

6 MS. FANELLI: Genevieve will be working
7 with Medi on next steps for completing the RAP for that
8 site, and we've been doing some engineering evaluation.

9 It's not written to report yet, but I've
10 looked at some of the reports. Dredging. So those are
11 the issues that we're trying to get our arms around right
12 now.

13 We've had internal discussions at the Trust
14 on -- now that remediation is going forward, how does
15 that comport with the EA that was done in 2000 for the
16 Mountain Lake enhancement project, and we've convinced
17 ourselves in internal meetings that this is all very
18 good, that the tenants and the elements of the EA have
19 not changed significantly, and so we feel that if we can
20 get all the rest of the elements in that EA, we'll go
21 forward.

22 Again, that's the planning and activity for
23 scheduling things, but we're looking at how to get that
24 dredging done, talking to Caltrans, which is not a
25 resolved lawsuit at this point.

1 That's still in progress, and then get with
2 Medi now that she's back on getting all of our documents
3 schedule.

4 It is still our goal, which has as its
5 remedy the removal of contaminants from Mountain Lake.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: In general, we've
7 talked about the idea of dredging. It would be really --
8 given that site is so visible, I think it would be really
9 nice to understand what people -- the concepts of what
10 might happen so we could begin to discuss that.

11 We don't really know what is more seriously
12 considered right now, but draining the lake would be
13 necessary, just a lot of things that I think a huge
14 number of people would like to talk about to be prepared.

15 If you did a RAP, would you want to
16 actually do construction this year?

17 MS. FANELLI: No.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

19 MS. FANELLI: The schedule that I sent out
20 shows construction I believe in 2013 and that still
21 stands.

22 So our goal would be to begin that RAP, and
23 I know public outreach and discussion is something that
24 the department's brought up. So we're working on that
25 plan.

1 So we'd like to complete the RAP this
2 calendar year, then be able to go in serious design the
3 next year in order to construct and the schedule.

4 MS. BLUM: Just to walk on what you've
5 both been saying, the community. I was saying that the
6 community around Mountain Lake is very vested in Mountain
7 Lake, and it would be very good PR for the Trust to in
8 advance of any formalized FS's, RAPs or whatever to
9 include the association in early conversations to avoid
10 confrontation at a later date.

11 MS. FANELLI: Your point is really well
12 taken. We've actually had those conversations.

13 MS. BLUM: Good.

14 MS. FANELLI: We are working on the
15 sequence to reach out to many people, including the
16 Friends of Mountain Lake, and have actually contributed a
17 lot to the enhancement plan and enhancement program in
18 the past.

19 We keep them apprised of what's going on
20 and we give them an opportunity to --

21 MS. TSUJI: Even as a prelude to the
22 outreach of the general community, the Department and the
23 Trust recent had a meeting with interested agencies so
24 that they weren't hearing it secondhand, you know, the
25 Mountain Lake project will be moving forward because it

1 has been somewhat on the back burner for quite a while.

2 All of a sudden you start hearing cleanup,
3 blah-blah-blah. You know, when did that happen.

4 So we did meet with a number of City
5 agencies just to give them a heads up, kind of DTSC and
6 working on our parallel contacts to them.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: If I may borrow just
8 maybe five more minutes from you, there's a -- I just
9 wanted to touch on a couple of other sites that are kind
10 of rattling around in my head.

11 A while ago we worked on the Merchant Road
12 site and we did an investigation. I'm not sure where
13 that is at the moment. And similarly Baker Beach site,
14 is that going?

15 MS. FANELLI: Merchant Road site from the
16 Trust perspective is on hold. We're working with the
17 Conservancy and the Park Service.

18 It's on hold from the standpoint that it's
19 an unknown site and the Trust has filed a claim with the
20 Army to take some responsibility, step forward.

21 We had some early participation with the
22 Army, and then I pulled back a little bit. So we are
23 working to try to convince them to move forward again on
24 that project. So we're having some internal discussions
25 to see how we can move ahead.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: But it is on hold.

2 MS. FANELLI: You know, I say on hold, but
3 it's too strong a word. We had made some good progress.

4 On hold from the standpoint that we need to
5 come to agreement on -- the Trust is not -- because of
6 our trying to focus our resources on known sites, not
7 unknown sites, we had filed claims with the Army and
8 Zurich on Merchant Road, but we are trying to get the
9 Army to step up.

10 And last December, actually right around
11 the holiday, we sort of asked them in a formal way to
12 step up, and then about the second week in January they
13 sent a letter saying we're not ready to quite step up.

14 So we're having this little conversation.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

16 And anything on Baker Beach?

17 MS. FANELLI: Baker Beach 1A is moving
18 forward. EA is our project manager on that. I'm not
19 sure what our schedule is.

20 We're in internal discussions with the Park
21 Service and I think our calendar has us completing the
22 environmental documents trying to get the feasibility
23 study and RAPs this calendar year. So we're still having
24 that as our target.

25 We've got that scheduled for 2012. It may

1 modify based on the bridge -- the bridge celebration.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: So there's still time
3 for us to be involved.

4 MS. FANELLI: We don't have -- we don't
5 have it -- we don't have a document issued. We're
6 drafting it and working with the Park Service.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. There are other
8 things, but we have only five minutes. I appreciate
9 that. Thank you very much.

10 MS. FANELLI: Just a quick -- for our next
11 meeting, I'm sure that there'll be things to maybe talk
12 about during planning, but I mentioned 2-28 historic
13 walk, and we're doing a work plan.

14 We are having an internal brown bag at the
15 Trust on the 17th, and I'm not necessarily extending the
16 invitation to the general public, but what I am saying is
17 once we do that and have our work plan, we're going to
18 submit it to Agnes.

19 Agnes and I talked about at the next
20 planning meeting or next RAB meeting, we could do a
21 presentation on that, as well. I'm sure there's interest
22 in that technology, how we're eating contaminants out of
23 the soil.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Great.

25 Agnes or DTSC, do you have anything?

1 MS. FARRES: No.

2 MS. TSUJI: Nothing else.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Any other public
4 comment?

5 Action items, I think there's a lot on our
6 plate. We're going to try to track some of these sites,
7 landfill E got a lot of attention tonight. I want to
8 follow up if we can on some of these others and get them
9 going.

10 Anything else before we close?

11 Thanks for a great discussion tonight.
12 Your participation, and without objection, meeting
13 adjourned.

14 (The meeting adjourned at 9:06 PM).

15 ---o0o---

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing arbitration was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing arbitration and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2011
GOLDEN GATE CLUB, BUILDING 135
PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: SARAH GOEKLER, CSR

License No. 13446

<p>1 ATTENDEES</p> <p>2 RAB Members:</p> <p>3 Doug Kern, Facilitator</p> <p>4 Eileen Fanelli</p> <p>5 Toni Krammer</p> <p>6 Jan Blum</p> <p>7 Edward Callanan</p> <p>8 Mark Youngkin</p> <p>9 Brian Ullensvang</p> <p>10 Gloria Gee</p> <p>11 Sam Berman</p> <p>12 Julie Cheever</p> <p>13 John Cadats, Zurich Insurance Company</p> <p>14 Bob Boggs, DTSC, Public Person</p> <p>15 Jeff Deis, Chief Operating Officer, Presidio</p> <p>16 Perry Myers, P.E., DTSC</p> <p>17 Radhika Majhail, DTSC</p> <p>18 John Fortuna, P.G., C.HG., Geosyntec</p> <p>19 Virginia Lasky, Project Manager, DTSC</p> <p>20 ---o0o---</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of</p> <p>2 the Meeting, and on March 8, 2011, at the Golden Gate</p> <p>3 Club, Building 135, Presidio of San Francisco,</p> <p>4 California, before me, SARAH GOEKLER, CSR No. 13446,</p> <p>5 State of California, there commenced a RAB meeting under</p> <p>6 the provisions of the Presidio Trust.</p> <p>7 ---o0o---</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
Page 2	Page 3
<p>1 AGENDA</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern, Facilitator</p> <p>4 2) Agenda Discussion and Approval</p> <p>5 3) Announcements & Old Business</p> <p>6 4) Committee Report - Mark Youngkin, Co-Chair</p> <p>7 5) Discussions & Presentations:</p> <p>8 A) Quarterly Report - Eileen Fanelli, Trust</p> <p>9 6) Regulatory Agency Status Updates/Inputs:</p> <p>10 Denise Tsuji, California Department of Toxic</p> <p>11 Substances Control</p> <p>12 Agnes Farres, California Regional Water</p> <p>13 Quality Control Board</p> <p>14 7) New Business</p> <p>15 8) Public Comment</p> <p>16 9) Action Items and Agenda Items</p> <p>17 10) Closing</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1 FACILITATOR KERN: It looks like our usual</p> <p>2 beginning time. Welcome, everyone, to the Presidio,</p> <p>3 San Francisco, and the Restoration Advisory Board</p> <p>4 meeting for March 2011. I almost said 2010. It's 2011.</p> <p>5 Time marches on. I'd like to welcome members of the</p> <p>6 Trust and park service, regulators. There are a lot of</p> <p>7 regulators here tonight. That's really great.</p> <p>8 Consultants for the Trust, welcome to the meeting.</p> <p>9 And since we have a lot of new faces, perhaps</p> <p>10 we can take a moment and go around and do a quick</p> <p>11 introduction. I'm Doug Kern, community member of the</p> <p>12 Restoration Advisory Board.</p> <p>13 MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm Mark Youngkin. I'm the</p> <p>14 community co-chair.</p> <p>15 MR. BERMAN: Sam Berman, community member.</p> <p>16 Brian Ullensvang with National Park Services. Gloria</p> <p>17 Gee, community member.</p> <p>18 MR. BOGGS: Bob Boggs with DTSC, but I'm here</p> <p>19 as a public person today.</p> <p>20 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome.</p> <p>21 MR. CADATS: I'm John Cadats (phonetic). I'm</p> <p>22 a consultant for Zurich Insurance Company.</p> <p>23 MR. FORTUNA: I'm Jeff Deis for the Trust.</p> <p>24 MS. FANELLI: Eileen Fanelli, the mediation</p> <p>25 manager of the Trust.</p>
Page 4	Page 5

<p>1 MR. FORTUNA: John Fortuna, Geosyntec, with 2 the consultants of the Trust on Landfill E. 3 MS. KRAMMER: Toni Krammer, community member. 4 MR. MYERS: Perry Myers with DTSC. 5 MS. MAJHAIL: Radhika Majhail with DTSC. 6 MS. LASKY: Virginia Lasky, DTSC. 7 MS. BLUM: Jan Blum, community member. 8 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Thanks, 9 everyone, for being here tonight. I hope everyone has 10 an agenda. We didn't quite put everything on the agenda 11 that may be discussed, so we might add a few things 12 after the quarterly report. May I assume, since we have 13 Geosyntec here, we'll have a discussion on Landfill E? 14 MS. FANELLI: Right. We promised at the last 15 RAB planning meeting that we would respond to some of 16 the comments that we received. 17 FACILITATOR KERN: Great. 18 MS. FANELLI: And I think there are a few 19 other very timely sites that perhaps we might ask 20 questions about. Mountain Lake, that comes to mind. 21 That will be 5(B). 22 Any announcements or old business? Are we 23 good? Committee report? 24 MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our planning committee 25 on the fourth Tuesday of last month. I forget the date.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 The 25th. It was a question-and-answer session for 2 Landfill E, and the RAB studies of the draft. Geosyntec 3 had two representatives there, John Fortuna, their 4 project manager; and Chris Hunt, Geotechnical engineer. 5 DTSC had three personnel present, so we had a good 6 question and answer session. It was a good turnout by 7 RAB members, community members, and I guess they're 8 going to follow up with some responses to our comments. 9 So we'll hear from them later about that. Our planning 10 committee is the fourth Tuesday of the month, and we'll 11 discuss that later on and come up with some topics, I 12 guess. Thank you. 13 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. 14 MR. BERMAN: Doug brought up his alternative 15 concept for Landfill E, and presumably, that's something 16 that might be discussed tonight, or is that off the 17 agenda? 18 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we'll find out when 19 we get to Landfill E questions. 20 MS. FANELLI: I'm a little speechless, I'm not 21 sure how to respond. 22 MR. BERMAN: I'm famous for asking 23 embarrassing questions. 24 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Thanks, Sam. 25 MS. FANELLI: I received a few comments from</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 Jan Blum, so I'll respond to those as we move through 2 this. 3 So, as most quarterly reports, I'll give you a 4 little bit of the milestones, where we are cost-wise and 5 schedule, talk about some of the site-specific status, 6 and then next quarter's activities. This is all 7 information that was in our first quarter fiscal year 8 FY11 report, which you got. And I know Jan has read it 9 because she sent me some specific questions that I will 10 answer. So first quarter ended December 30th, 2010. 11 So under CERCLA, we ended up completing our 12 first year construction waste removal at Fill Site 1 and 13 Landfill 2. And so we've been conducting, basically, 14 maintenance activities since that time. We also 15 completed some draft RI sections of the RI/FS RAP for 16 Baker Beach 1A, and that is currently being reviewed 17 with the park service before we finalize it. And we did 18 prepare the preliminary draft FS RAP for Landfill E, and 19 you received that in second quarter of this year, but 20 those are the main accomplishments. 21 We are also continuing to work on a data 22 compilation for Baker Beach 2, an evaluation of that 23 data. That work will be reviewed first with the park 24 service prior to us issuing it, but we are making 25 progress on that. And those were the primary activities</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p>	<p>1 under CERCLA. 2 In the petroleum program, we did submit no 3 further action request for 144 tanks that are considered 4 the unsubstantiated tanks in the Army's original list, 5 our Priority 8, and we submitted that to Agnes for her 6 review. Those tanks are deemed to be nonexistent, and 7 we did a research through our archives and other 8 documents to try to determine if there was any other 9 evidence of their presence and then document our 10 conclusions. We've since completed all of the 11 unsubstantiated tanks and submitted those for Agnes' 12 closure. And Agnes got through several tank sites that 13 we had submitted for closure in Priority 6 and closed 14 those. 15 And under lead-based paint, we are continuing 16 to pick up steam, and we submitted multiple requests for 17 no further action, which were several of the residential 18 units at the Trust, and received DTSC closure on those. 19 The individual sites are all documented in the report. 20 Sam? 21 MR. BERMAN: Is an unsubstantiated tank one 22 that doesn't exist? 23 MS. FANELLI: These were tanks that the Army 24 had identified back in 1999, about the time the Trust 25 took over responsibility for the remediation program,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p>

<p>1 and they provided a list of every tank that they could 2 probably think of, and that list actually included 3 buildings. They didn't know if a tank existed or did 4 not exist, but it could, and to, in essence, kind of 5 cover themselves, they put the tank on the list. 6 And so we had a process to go through, 7 basically, and clean out that list, and those tanks -- 8 we call them "unsubstantiated." Some of them did exist, 9 and we have closure documentation for them and have 10 processed them as such. Other ones we determined did 11 not exist and just provided that documentation that they 12 did not exist. 13 Does that make sense? 14 MR. BERMAN: Not quite, because if some of 15 them were actually there but they're substantiated, then 16 we close them; right? 17 MS. FANELLI: Then we close them. That's 18 right. 19 MR. BERMAN: So the unsubstantiated tanks -- 20 MS. FANELLI: If they are actually there, we 21 don't call them unsubstantiated anymore. It was just 22 the first grouping, how we grouped them. 23 MR. BERMAN: Right. So these 144 tanks that 24 are in this unsubstantiated group, do any of them exist? 25 MS. FANELLI: No. None of those existed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 MR. BERMAN: That's why I was confused. So 2 they're all just virtual tanks? 3 MS. FANELLI: Right. 4 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess they didn't hold 5 too much. 6 MS. FANELLI: This is a summary of our current 7 budget evaluation. Our incurred estimate at completion 8 is 162 million, and that is increased over the last 9 quarter. And I will ascribe to you the reasons for that 10 increase. That was the comments that I received from 11 Jan. 12 This just works through the original Army 13 advance, the estimated cost to complete the program 14 above the Army advance, offsets from interest received 15 through first quarter, offsets for claims received 16 through first quarter, and then Trust funding primarily 17 for labor staff time that we consider an offset. So the 18 remaining cost to complete the program of about 19 34 million. And that includes our estimate of both 20 known sites that would be covered under the RSL policy 21 and unknown sites that would be covered under the reel. 22 So I'll go through this, and I'll come back to 23 why it went up -- what projects went up. 24 MR. BERMAN: Do you have a breakdown of who -- 25 where the -- some of those remittances come from?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 MS. FANELLI: I'm sorry? 2 MR. BERMAN: On the previous slide, you have 3 offsets, and you want to identify where they came from. 4 MS. FANELLI: Well, the interest was interest 5 received -- 6 MR. BERMAN: No. The interest is there 7 separately. I'm talking about the offsets where it says 8 "to date claims received." 9 MS. FANELLI: Oh, claims received. That came 10 from a variety of different projects. The largest 11 one -- the largest chunk being the Baker Beach 2A claim, 12 in recovery from the Army on that. There's also been 13 recovery for unknown claims for sites from Zurich and 14 the Army for several tank sites. And I do have that 15 detail. I don't have it here with me, but I -- 16 MR. BERMAN: But it's primarily the Army 17 reserve? 18 MS. FANELLI: It's all the Army -- 19 MR. BERMAN: There's no one else contributed 20 to that? 21 MS. FANELLI: No. 22 MR. BERMAN: Okay. Thank you. 23 MS. FANELLI: Sure. This just shows you our 24 current breakdown in terms of cost from CERCLA -- the 25 CERCLA program, the lead-based paint in soil, petroleum</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p>	<p>1 and admin. And again, the same type of costs and 2 looking at what we have to complete. So a little detail 3 into the main programs. 4 The projects with the greatest activity for 5 that first quarter, not surprisingly Landfill 10, and 6 these were the final costs to complete the remediation 7 there in the cover. 8 Baker Beach 2, we have been doing a fair 9 amount of research and summarizing of all of the 10 existing data. That report will be forthcoming once 11 we've completed it and park service has the opportunity 12 to review it. And then we'll be submitting it out to 13 DTSC for their review. But we've been making some 14 progress there. 15 Fill Site 1/Landfill 2, no surprise. The 16 majority of the first season construction costs are in, 17 and that's what they're at. They're a little bit north 18 of \$5 million to date. 19 And then Landfill E costs, and those costs 20 reflect some of the additional studies that we did in 21 the end of summer, early fall, and completion of that 22 preliminary FS RAP document that you had the opportunity 23 to review. 24 And then lead-based paint. We spent a lot of 25 time working on houses in the east housing district.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>

<p>1 And completing the cleanups along the drip line and 2 documentation.</p> <p>3 MR. BERMAN: So there's the -- that's the best 4 budget for costs, to complete?</p> <p>5 MS. FANELLI: Correct. So we're very close to 6 being finished on 10. We may actually come in under on 7 10 with our revised budgets.</p> <p>8 MR. BERMAN: So when I look at that and I look 9 at Landfill 2, does that mean there's a chance that 10 there would be a few million saved?</p> <p>11 MS. FANELLI: Yes. Actually, right now our 12 budgets are fairly conservative, and we do carry 13 contingencies, and we carry about a million on the Fill 14 Site 1/Landfill 2 budgets and contingencies.</p> <p>15 We are doing the second season grading plans 16 now, and once we're finalized with those and I have the 17 engineer's cost estimate to complete, then I'll have a 18 better sense of what kind of savings we may be looking 19 at there, but I'm anticipating that we will complete 20 that project under budget.</p> <p>21 MR. BERMAN: Under budget includes the 22 contingencies?</p> <p>23 MS. FANELLI: It does.</p> <p>24 MR. BERMAN: And is there sort of a fixed 25 percentage that you use, or is it worked out different</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 for each?</p> <p>2 MS. FANELLI: It works out differently for 3 each site, and it depends quite a bit on where we are in 4 the process. So as we get towards completion, usually 5 our contingencies are reduced.</p> <p>6 In terms of schedule on RAP 4, we're working 7 on the remedial construction and completion report and 8 site certification request. We have done one internal 9 round of review, and we're working on edits. Once we're 10 completed with that, we'll be sharing it with the park 11 service for Landfill 10 and Graded Area 9, of course. 12 And we'll be submitting it to DTSC for review.</p> <p>13 If you remember, CHP range was a part of 14 RAP 4, and we are working -- EKI is the lead to complete 15 that design, and they're working closely with the park 16 service on that, and we are targeting a construction 17 this summer. And we're actually trying to find ways, 18 working with the park sheriff, that we can accelerate 19 that because there's a lot of work planned by the 20 conservancy and the park service in that area, so we're 21 looking to see what we can do to not be on top of each 22 other.</p> <p>23 The draft RI/FS RAP for Baker Beach 1 is under 24 preparation. Again, we're in review on that with the 25 park service.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 Landfill E, we're hoping to get the draft RAP 2 out at the end of this month, and we're going to be 3 talking about that site a little bit more later. Baker 4 Beach 2, as I described, we are working on a data gaps 5 analysis. We believe there's a need for some additional 6 site characterization data before we go to a RAP, and 7 that will be -- that scope will be proposed in the data 8 review report. And again, we're working first to get a 9 copy reviewed with the park service, and then we will be 10 moving forward to get that out to DTSC.</p> <p>11 Merchant Road, we have some activity on it. I 12 think I reported last month it is an unknown site, so it 13 is a Trust position that it's an Army site. We have 14 been acting as the Army sort of implementation arm, and 15 then we came to disagreements, we hope just momentarily, 16 on responsibility. So we're work through that issue 17 with the Army before we move forward.</p> <p>18 We are working to try to get what we call 19 RAP 6B, which is Battery-Howe Wagner and Fill Site 6B, 20 kicked off. Geomatrix AMEC has been looking at the 21 existing data and doing a data gaps analysis. And based 22 on that, we'll be preparing a site characterization work 23 plan. They're also working on 207/231, which is their 24 priority. So this one is lagging just a little bit.</p> <p>25 And then on Mountain Lake we do have URS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p>	<p>1 working on an evaluation of the engineering alternatives 2 for remediation of the lake sediments. We are trying to 3 develop a schedule internally and then share that 4 schedule with DTSC to identify a meaningful date that we 5 would be able to get a preliminary RAP out.</p> <p>6 And so you'll probably hear more on that in 7 the near future. Our goal would be to issue it sometime 8 this calendar year. We would like to complete the 9 planning documents this calendar year. So, although it 10 is fast -- in a fast-paced mode, we're developing a 11 better schedule that we can then share with DTSC so that 12 we can get somebody that we can actually commit to and 13 have meaningful discussions on.</p> <p>14 Other items that are moving forward, 15 Building 937. We are resurrecting the remedial action 16 work plan that had been approved by DTSC, I think, a few 17 years ago when we had a tenant for Building 937. And 18 the tenant was going to implement a portion of that 19 work. The Trust has made the decision to go ahead and 20 implement that ourselves, and so we are resurrecting 21 that plan and trying to develop some plans and specs and 22 keep that -- we're hoping we can do that construction 23 this calendar year as well, preferably in summer. That 24 work is interior to a building. That may give us a 25 little bit more flexibility in construction season</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p>

<p>1 because we're not going to be as exposed to the 2 elements.</p> <p>3 And then we talked about 207/231 last time.</p> <p>4 We have prepared a work plan for the in situ thermal 5 treatment, and I'll send you all a PDF copy of it so 6 that you can take a look at it. We've provided it to 7 Agnes for her review and comment, and we're hoping to 8 begin implementation of that program in May. It will 9 likely go through October. May not be a lot to see if 10 it all goes well until the June time frame, when we'll 11 actually be able to get equipment and utilities 12 relocated and the power drops, et cetera.</p> <p>13 And I have talked with a mechanic who's been 14 working on that and with Ryan, and we'd be happy to give 15 you a presentation on that technology, maybe at your 16 next RAB meeting. AMEC will be available, as will Ryan. 17 So if you'd like that, let me know. I'll be happy to go 18 through that.</p> <p>19 FACILITATOR KERN: I certainly have a number 20 of questions about -- I think I'm visualizing it 21 correctly. There are these -- some kinds of rods or 22 problems and either electricity or heat is -- so, 23 obviously, I don't know what is happening. So ...</p> <p>24 MS. FANELLI: The ground is heated using a 25 series of, I guess, electrodes and special types of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 electrode wells, if you will. And electricity and 2 moisture is used to generate heat, raising the ground 3 temperature to about 100 degrees C to generate steam, 4 volatilize off the TPH and solvent.</p> <p>5 That's captured, and that's treated 6 separately. And that system is run until, based on 7 sampling, we've removed the contaminants from the soil 8 matrix. But that's a very simple overview, and the 9 details could be provided by others better than I can.</p> <p>10 FACILITATOR KERN: I think my questions are 11 going to be around, like, the venting, and how is it 12 collected, and is there opportunity for explosive 13 potential, things of that nature.</p> <p>14 MS. FANELLI: Sure.</p> <p>15 MR. BERMAN: How deep can they go and be 16 successful?</p> <p>17 MS. FANELLI: Well, I'm thinking back to the 18 vendor's presentation to us. And the deepest, I 19 believe, they've done it is as deep as 100, 110 feet. 20 In our case, we wouldn't be going that deep. 20 feet.</p> <p>21 MR. BOGGS: You can't go below groundwater. 22 I've been involved in a couple treatability studies and 23 that particular -- are very similar. I don't know the 24 exact details of who the vendor is or whatever. What 25 Doug was talking about would be a particular concern,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 i.e., when it starts volatilizing off, it tends to be a 2 bigger area where it necessarily collected. So the 3 first treatability study, we had difficulties, and 4 things were -- they had kind of a tent collect the 5 vapors, probably through carbon. It's a petroleum 6 hydrocarbon. It gets taken out of the air very well 7 with carbon, gets volatilized with the heat. It's just 8 how much of that are you actually collecting. The 9 technology has come a long way. They have made 10 improvements, so I don't know the current status. But 11 if done properly, it should work great.</p> <p>12 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess the other question 13 I have, you mentioned groundwater. If you were having 14 these electrodes near the groundwater, it seems like it 15 would be a huge sink for the energy and the heat, or the 16 electricity, or however it's done. Would it just go 17 right into the groundwater? So those are the kinds of 18 things I'd be interested in.</p> <p>19 MS. FANELLI: Sure. And I can't really answer 20 them. I know they do like a wet system. They actually 21 apply water to the electrodes to keep it wet, but it 22 would be better to hear it from the technical folks.</p> <p>23 On lead-based paint, where we're working 24 currently are several neighborhoods -- Quarry, Wyman, 25 Morton Street, Sanches, Sibley. Looks like she's got</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p>	<p>1 Morton down twice here. And several nonresidential 2 buildings. And those sites are basically, in our mind, 3 done. We are preparing the closure documentation for 4 them, and then we're beginning assessments in the Upper 5 Liggett, Simonds Loop neighborhoods, South Baker Beach, 6 and several of the nonresidential buildings. And Nina 7 is heading that up. So we're moving pretty quick on 8 that one.</p> <p>9 MS. CHEEVER: Eileen, I'm just wondering, 10 ballpark. How far along is the lead-based paint 11 program? I was wondering because someone was asking me 12 to describe the programs, and I didn't have a sense how 13 far along the lead-based paint program was along.</p> <p>14 MS. FANELLI: That's a very good question, 15 Julie, and it's sometimes hard to answer. We've done 16 assessment at -- I'd say three-quarters of the 17 buildings.</p> <p>18 MS. CHEEVER: Great.</p> <p>19 MS. FANELLI: But what we need to do now some 20 of that was done prior to the agreed-upon work plan. 21 And so we're spending some time going back just to make 22 sure that what we had done in the past meets all the 23 requirements, and most of the time it does. And when it 24 does, we might have to go out and grab an additional 25 sample here and there. But we've completed a fair</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p>

<p>1 amount of assessment activities, so we have a good 2 handle on what our problem is. There are some buildings 3 we haven't done anything with yet, and those are 4 buildings where the Trust needs to make a decision about 5 stabilizing the exterior paint first. So in those 6 cases, we don't know what -- we haven't necessarily 7 sampled, so we don't know what the issues are.</p> <p>8 I think I've said in the past that we're, 9 like, 50 percent completed. I think it's probably a 10 little bit higher than that. But we do have an 11 aggressive schedule. We are trying to get through the 12 main majority of remaining residential and 13 nonresidential buildings by the end of calendar year 14 2012. So it'll be a fairly intensive program between 15 now and the end of 2012.</p> <p>16 MS. CHEEVER: Thank you.</p> <p>17 MR. BERMAN: Is 937 going to get a new roof?</p> <p>18 MS. FANELLI: I don't know. Jeff, is Building 19 937 going to get a new roof?</p> <p>20 MR. DEIS: We have no plans to replace the 21 roof at this point. We don't have it in our budget for 22 any kind of capital work on that, at least in the near 23 future.</p> <p>24 MR. BERMAN: So it's all going to be internal, 25 just cosmetic inside?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 MS. FANELLI: Well, the work that we need to 2 do there is remove the slab. There's some soil vapor 3 that we need to address. So we would do that work 4 underneath the slab, and then repair it and leave it, 5 and whatever future development happens there hasn't 6 been decided at this point, but it kicks back to 7 others -- other remediation to figure that out.</p> <p>8 MR. DEIS: I was going to say the remediation 9 procedure for that does not require the structure of the 10 roof. The roof wouldn't be disturbed.</p> <p>11 MS. FANELLI: No.</p> <p>12 MR. BERMAN: The roof doesn't look very good.</p> <p>13 MS. FANELLI: So next quarter, we're just 14 continuing to move forward. Our biggest activities are 15 to finalize the design for final grading at Fill Site 16 1/Landfill 2.</p> <p>17 Obviously, we're hoping to issue the draft RAP 18 for Landfill E and initiate the remedial construction 19 documents. We're hoping that we can complete a 20 preliminary draft RI/FS for Baker Beach 1A. It's 21 probably overly optimistic that it would be issued to 22 DTSC, but we're hoping to get a document to park service 23 to take a look at and start commenting on.</p> <p>24 And then we'd like to complete our data 25 evaluation and proposed field sampling plan for Baker</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 Beach 2 site. So that's our primary focus under CERCLA. 2 Under petroleum, I say here, "submit closure 3 documentation for the remaining Priority 8 tanks." We 4 actually have submitted documentation, I think now, for 5 all tanks that we're aware of on the Presidio. So that 6 feels good. We put it all in Agnes' basket to handle at 7 this point, and we're hoping to be able to initiate or 8 at least get approvals -- start the approval process on 9 the in situ treatment at 228 by the historical wall. So 10 we're looking to move on that.</p> <p>11 And then lead-based paint. As I mentioned 12 before, we're just going to continue to work that 13 process, per our schedule.</p> <p>14 I had a couple of questions on the budget 15 here. I'm going to go all the way back to the budget 16 here. 162. I'm going to rely on your math because you 17 have it written down here that our budget went up about 18 \$2 million from what it was in the previous quarter. 19 That's primarily being driven by Baker Beach 1A. Baker 20 Beach 1A, if you remember, in the past was a smaller -- 21 thought to be a smaller pile of this roofing material 22 that contains PAH contaminants and through RI work 23 completed in late summer/early fall. We realized that 24 it was a much larger extent.</p> <p>25 And so MACTEC is the consultant working on</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p>	<p>1 that project. Angela Liang is the Trust project 2 manager. They looked at the remedial alternatives and 3 came up with cost estimates for the removal of this 4 larger volume of material. And that was the primary 5 driver for the increased cost on that site. It's a 6 change in the volume of the material that has to be 7 removed.</p> <p>8 Fill Site 1/Landfill 2. What's happened there 9 really isn't an increase or decrease in our cost 10 estimate. We had it in the wrong category. So 11 basically, we had underestimated one and overestimated 12 the other. And what we simply did was flip them in our 13 accounting system so that the costs are in the right 14 spot. And that was the main change there. As I said, 15 we're still carrying in total about a million of 16 contingency on that project. I fully suspect that we're 17 going to come in under budget from what that contingency 18 projection is, but I can't give you any exact numbers 19 now until we finish those final grading plans.</p> <p>20 MR. BERMAN: Just a question about Baker 21 Beach 1. If the original estimate by the Army wasn't 22 there for the volume, and so the -- I mean, now after 23 you sampled everything, it's considerably larger than 24 what the Army had said, so is any of that responsibility 25 back on the Army at all?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p>

<p>1 MS. FANELLI: Unfortunately, no, it's not. 2 It's very similar -- remember when we were in RAP 3, and 3 we had the incinerator ash in building 669? It was much 4 larger a site than the Army had indicated or thought, 5 but per our agreement with the Army, we really have no 6 avenue to go back to them on those particular sites. 7 So, no. That's one that the Trust bought. 8 MR. BERMAN: 669 wasn't so bad, but this is a 9 huge one. 10 MS. FANELLI: Actually, 669 escalated up to 11 \$1.6 million from its original estimate, so it was 12 pretty high. These, again, are conservative numbers. 13 We put a lot of contingencies in them, and we're still 14 early in the process. So as we work through it, we'll 15 get a better handle on what the costs are actually going 16 to be. 17 MS. GEE: You mentioned that the numbers you 18 put together, you use a conservative way of estimating 19 them, and I was wondering how did you handle, like, the 20 factor of -- like, now that we're all really having much 21 higher energy costs, and how does that affect the 22 contract just for the removal of the waste and things 23 like that? 24 MS. FANELLI: That's a good question. We tend 25 to -- depending on where we are in the design, the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 engineers will use standard records or engineering 2 supporting documents that are updated on somewhat of a 3 regular basis. So in terms of fuel costs or diesel 4 costs, those would be captured when an update occurs. 5 If an update hadn't occurred, it may not be 6 captured, but that is one reason why we do add 7 contingencies because there are certain things that we 8 really don't know how much they're going to cost us 9 until we bid. 10 The bidding on Fill Site 1/Landfill 2 was 11 pretty good. We got some very good competitive rates on 12 that one. Whether or not we'll see that on other 13 projects, it's hard to say, particularly if there's a 14 lot of truck hauling in and out, with diesel costs. 15 MS. GEE: Like when we have those contractors, 16 do they have -- like now there's so much uncertainty, 17 like, facing fuel costs. So would there be some 18 contract that would have -- I don't know -- like an out 19 clause, you know, well, assuming that energy prices, 20 fuel costs don't exceed a certain percentage. But what 21 happens if they really hit the roof, they'll exceed 22 that? Are there things like that? 23 MS. FANELLI: There are things like that 24 sometimes. We haven't actually had them in any of our 25 contracts, but they do exist. We have had change order</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 requests for escalation in oil prices. 2 For example, on Landfill 10 when the paving 3 was completed, the contractor asked for an escalation 4 for oil because the price of oil had changed. We denied 5 it, so I didn't give it to them because it wasn't set up 6 in the contract that that was reasonable or that they 7 should expect that. And we didn't think there had been 8 enough time lapse between their bid and when the 9 escalation had occurred. But it does happen. If 10 there's that much uncertainty, we could get bids like 11 that, but we haven't to date. 12 MR. BERMAN: A question about dealing with the 13 cost of the cleanups when the volumes turn out to be 14 much more than they are, and the estimates for the 15 99 million that went in there, is that -- that adds to 16 the cost, makes it go up over the amounts. Are those 17 eligible for reimbursement from Zurich? 18 MS. FANELLI: Well Zurich endorses a proposed 19 remedy for a particular site, and so it's not really 20 eligible for reimbursement in the sense if it's 21 enumerated site. The costs need to be reasonable and 22 necessary, so, yes. If we have more material for an 23 endorsed remedy, yes, we will have that covered in a 24 sense that we are still working towards our self-insured 25 retention amount, and those costs would count as</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p>	<p>1 allowable towards that self-insured retention. 2 Does that answer your question? 3 MR. BERMAN: Sort of. But in the end, when 4 the cost goes up, the money has to come from somewhere. 5 And presumably, if it is covered by -- one of the Zurich 6 policies, then Zurich is looking at that and presumably 7 the Trust is looking at it, too, because, I mean, now 8 you're some 30 million short from the anticipated funds. 9 MS. FANELLI: So to the extent that these 10 costs cause the Trust to expend dollars above the 11 self-insured retention, yes, the Trust would look to 12 Zurich under the RSL policy to cover those costs, if 13 that answers the question. But we are not to date at 14 that self-insured retention. We're getting close, but 15 we're not there yet. 16 MR. BERMAN: It just makes us nervous. That's 17 all. 18 MS. FANELLI: I'm sure it makes the Trust's 19 financial department nervous, too. So, yes, we're all 20 concerned, and we're trying to do the best job and 21 trying to do what's reasonable and necessary to make the 22 sites clean, or remedy, to be protected for human health 23 and the environment. 24 Any other questions? 25 FACILITATOR KERN: I might want to come back</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p>

<p>1 to some of these after we go through Landfill E.</p> <p>2 MS. FANELLI: John, do you need -- you don't</p> <p>3 need the laptop?</p> <p>4 MR. FORTUNA: So just to recap, the Trust</p> <p>5 provided the RAB with a preliminary draft copy of the</p> <p>6 action plan for Landfill E, I believe, on February</p> <p>7 14th, and there was a RAB committee meeting on</p> <p>8 February 22nd. I just wanted to respond to the</p> <p>9 questions that were presented at that meeting, maybe not</p> <p>10 respond to them fully but give you an idea how we're</p> <p>11 addressing the concerns that were expressed in that</p> <p>12 meeting.</p> <p>13 Well, there was several questions that came up</p> <p>14 around groundwater, and the first was whether there was</p> <p>15 a signature in groundwater, the need for a downgrade to</p> <p>16 the landfill that would be different than a groundwater</p> <p>17 signature upgrading or surrounding the landfill. And by</p> <p>18 "signature," I took that to not necessarily mean impact</p> <p>19 as a contaminate, but a cation and anion signature or</p> <p>20 some influence of the landfill on groundwater.</p> <p>21 We've gone back and reviewed some of the</p> <p>22 existing data documentation, and sample reports have</p> <p>23 been done in the past, and there are some differences in</p> <p>24 groundwater associated with the landfill and groundwater</p> <p>25 upgrading. And in the preliminary review, the things</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 that stood out were all solids, sulfate and pH. So the</p> <p>2 follow-on or part two to the question regarding the</p> <p>3 signature is will the monitoring program -- the post</p> <p>4 monitoring program take into account these parameters</p> <p>5 and be appropriate to monitor changes in that signature?</p> <p>6 And the answer is, yes, it will.</p> <p>7 The planned -- again, although the monitoring</p> <p>8 program details will be presented in the design</p> <p>9 documents, the plan for groundwater monitoring is the</p> <p>10 same approach that's taken now for Landfill E, and</p> <p>11 that's to monitor all the constituents that have been</p> <p>12 identified in soil and identified in retaining</p> <p>13 groundwater, and also the general chemistry parameters,</p> <p>14 including cations and anions.</p> <p>15 And so we're going to look into that data a</p> <p>16 little more for a characterization, based on cation and</p> <p>17 anion signature, and consider that in preparation of the</p> <p>18 monitoring program, but in the appropriate parameters</p> <p>19 for the changes.</p> <p>20 MR. BOGGS: What else did you use for that</p> <p>21 upgrading?</p> <p>22 MR. FORTUNA: I didn't look at a lot of the</p> <p>23 raw data in detail. I looked at the summary that was</p> <p>24 done in the EKI 2003 report on groundwater. And those</p> <p>25 are what they noted in their evaluation in 2003. I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 haven't looked at the data since 2003, yes. So again,</p> <p>2 we will be looking at this in a little bit more detail.</p> <p>3 MR. BOGGS: Do you know of wells they used as</p> <p>4 the upgrading?</p> <p>5 MR. FORTUNA: I don't, off the top of my head.</p> <p>6 MR. BERMAN: John, historically, when you look</p> <p>7 at landfills that are on a slope like that and -- is</p> <p>8 there historical information about signature</p> <p>9 differences? I mean, I don't know if anything would be</p> <p>10 meaningful. It depends on the soil and all that, but</p> <p>11 I'm just curious as to whether people have looked at</p> <p>12 that in the past with landfills.</p> <p>13 MR. FORTUNA: Yeah. People have looked at it</p> <p>14 for landfills. You know, for active municipal landfills</p> <p>15 that produce lechay (phonetic), one of the things they</p> <p>16 look at is the signature of the lechay, to develop a</p> <p>17 monitoring program for groundwater.</p> <p>18 For Landfill E, and I don't want to speak to</p> <p>19 this issue too much, but there's a number of complicated</p> <p>20 factors here. There's a signature of surface water,</p> <p>21 which we don't know right now, but is potentially</p> <p>22 getting into the waste and how is that changed. And so</p> <p>23 there's some pieces to sort out, but I think the</p> <p>24 response for now is, there is data and we're going to be</p> <p>25 looking at it, and we'll make sure the monitoring moving</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>	<p>1 forward is appropriate.</p> <p>2 MR. BOGGS: So are you looking at both wells</p> <p>3 within the landfill, below the landfill, the upgrading</p> <p>4 of the landfill and then upgrading, but we don't know</p> <p>5 which upgrading you're looking at?</p> <p>6 MR. FORTUNA: We'll be looking at all of the</p> <p>7 wells in Landfill E. But again, I haven't gotten into</p> <p>8 that data evaluation in detail yet. I've simply</p> <p>9 reviewed some of the past work that's been done.</p> <p>10 MS. CHEEVER: Are you thinking a particular</p> <p>11 well is important?</p> <p>12 MR. BOGGS: I was just curious. There's not a</p> <p>13 lot of upgrading of wells in Landfill E, so where from</p> <p>14 other sites that you would look at? The wells that I</p> <p>15 know that are in that vicinity, there's probably some</p> <p>16 arguments that the well that's immediately upgrading of</p> <p>17 the landfill could be affected by the landfill. Other</p> <p>18 wells that may be upgraded may be pretty far away, and</p> <p>19 they may actually be part of a watershed that goes to a</p> <p>20 different direction. I was just curious because I</p> <p>21 haven't looked. I was just wanting to know what wells</p> <p>22 are being looked at for that.</p> <p>23 Some of this data they're talking about, that</p> <p>24 go into the signature as far as cations and anions, pH,</p> <p>25 all those, et cetera aren't necessarily monitored in all</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>

<p>1 the wells, so I was just trying to understand where they 2 were looking and why.</p> <p>3 MR. BERMAN: When you look at that, John, will 4 you sort of answer Bob's concern there and make sure the 5 wells are really -- as part of the upgrading?</p> <p>6 MR. FORTUNA: Absolutely. Again, we haven't 7 gotten into the data in great detail, but we'll answer 8 that question. There's the other details like well 9 screening formation versus screening bedrock, because 10 they'll have different signatures and so forth. So we 11 need to sort all that out.</p> <p>12 A related question was on the monitoring 13 program for the different alternatives and whether the 14 monitoring programs were going to be the same for each 15 alternative or whether they would be different. Because 16 there seems to be some inconsistency for processing -- 17 for monitoring, tests for monitoring. And the answer 18 would be they would be the same monitoring program for 19 all alternatives, so we've gone back in and matched the 20 tests with the process in that regard, and we'll have 21 some discussions in the draft on what that monitoring 22 program will be, in a general way. And the details will 23 be differed to the design, but there will be some more 24 in there later.</p> <p>25 There was another question about how green</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 criteria were applied in remedy selection in the FS RAP 2 and whether that application was consistent among 3 alternatives. And so we went back and looked at that in 4 a little bit more detail, and the way that we're 5 handling green criteria in the FS RAP is we're using 6 methodology presented in DTSC's interim green 7 remediation advisory, which is a 2009 document that DTSC 8 issued.</p> <p>9 And in that document they present the concept 10 of a Green Remediation Evaluation Matrix, or GREM table. 11 And it's essentially a one-page table that you prepare 12 for each alternative, where you go through and look at 13 different environmental stressors, and you first answer 14 yes/no as to whether the remedy would impact those 15 stressors, and then you give the remedy a qualitative or 16 quantitative score for each of those environment 17 stressors.</p> <p>18 And the methodology for quantitatively scoring 19 gravities in terms of green remediation are not very 20 well-developed. The qualitative score is the way we've 21 chosen for this evaluation. So for each of the proposed 22 remedies, we've completed the GREM evaluation matrix 23 table, and those will be included as an appendix in the 24 draft FS RAP. We have not used that evaluation as 25 threshold or balancing criteria for remedy selection.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 We've presented them for comparison purposes to be 2 considered as -- potentially as additional or modifying 3 criteria, but really for comparison purposes rather than 4 remedy selection.</p> <p>5 We do anticipate that for the selective 6 remedy, the GREM evaluation will be used to direct us to 7 areas that maybe are not so green and help us optimize 8 for design. So the revised document will have more 9 consistency how those criteria are applied, but the 10 bottom line is they're not going to be applied as a 11 critical criteria for remedy selection.</p> <p>12 MR. BERMAN: That's just a unilateral 13 decision; right? You didn't have to make that decision?</p> <p>14 MS. FANELLI: Sam, explain a little bit. 15 Decision for what?</p> <p>16 MR. BERMAN: Well, there may be cost factors 17 are involved in that, and so we might come in and if, in 18 fact, comparing some alternatives and looking at 19 the economics, there may be one that is not very green 20 and somehow it's only worthwhile to examine that in some 21 sense if it ends up having some economic factor 22 associated with it. If there's no economic factor 23 associated with it, then it's just kind of an 24 interesting story. But who cares?</p> <p>25 MS. FANELLI: We evaluated it because DTSC had</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p>	<p>1 requested that we get into incorporating that type of 2 analysis into our FS RAPs. But because it's new and 3 it's difficult to do quantitative analysis on it, we 4 chose to approach it from the qualitative standpoint. I 5 think cost is one criteria that we look at for the 6 regular criteria.</p> <p>7 MR. BOGGS: I can probably get in a little 8 bit. The regulations in evaluating alternatives have 9 nine criteria, and cost is one of them. This green 10 remediation evaluation, it's not regulation yet. So how 11 they implement it versus it's not one of the nine 12 criteria that's set in law that helps you decide -- pick 13 the alternative, but it can be used for comparison for 14 alternatives like they're suggesting. It's not 15 regulatory-driven like the existing criteria.</p> <p>16 MR. BERMAN: So it's really informational 17 until it becomes part of the requirements?</p> <p>18 MR. FORTUNA: Yeah. That's the summary. I 19 mean, it can inform one of the nine -- one of the nine 20 criteria. For example, one of the modifying criteria, 21 which is one of the nine, is public acceptance or 22 regulatory acceptance. And if the regulatory agency 23 republic is placing very high priority on the 24 remediation, then that becomes part of the criteria, 25 but, per se, it's not the primary selection.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>

<p>1 There was another comment about sites for --</p> <p>2 FS RAP sites for -- in particular, between landfill</p> <p>3 materials and native materials. And, you know, we're</p> <p>4 trying to find the balance between providing sort of a</p> <p>5 summary overview of what of the conceptual site model at</p> <p>6 the site, as it informs remedy selection without getting</p> <p>7 into too much detail.</p> <p>8 So I did go back to some of the prior</p> <p>9 documents in regards to this particular role, and there</p> <p>10 are some really good descriptions in the previous EKI</p> <p>11 documents, again, that related principally to this clay</p> <p>12 that's potentially in that layer along the valley,</p> <p>13 accessing the source of that clay. There's some</p> <p>14 additional information on material properties and</p> <p>15 strings of that material from previous documents and</p> <p>16 also from the investigations that we've done.</p> <p>17 And all of those will inform the design for</p> <p>18 the remedy and will be considered in the design of the</p> <p>19 remedy, but they don't really inform selection of the</p> <p>20 remedy. So, you know, our preference is to try to keep</p> <p>21 the discussions general in that regard but not be</p> <p>22 oversimplified. So we're going to look at that and</p> <p>23 revise that a little bit, but probably not get into</p> <p>24 great detail.</p> <p>25 There was another question on seismic safety</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 and whether it would be advantageous to potentially do</p> <p>2 some of the seismic evaluations in advance and/or</p> <p>3 present them in FS RAP. And I think the response to</p> <p>4 that is -- because the FS RAP is on a different</p> <p>5 timetable from the design, the seismic analyses aren't</p> <p>6 complete. It's better to present them in FS RAP</p> <p>7 document. We do know that LFE is located in the area by</p> <p>8 a seismic city. We know the maximum is a 7.9, and we'll</p> <p>9 design to those criteria using the data that we've</p> <p>10 collected for material strength and so forth. And we've</p> <p>11 added some text to FS RAP to reflect the size of the</p> <p>12 environment that we're working in, and that will be</p> <p>13 considering those criteria design, but the size of the</p> <p>14 evaluation is not done to the point that we complete an</p> <p>15 FS RAP document.</p> <p>16 MR. BERMAN: Are there any plans for doing</p> <p>17 strength of the landfill materials, show stress, seismic</p> <p>18 action, all those sorts of things?</p> <p>19 MR. FORTUNA: There are. There's a number of</p> <p>20 investigations that have been done in the past, and so</p> <p>21 that data is reported. Geosyntec also did two days of</p> <p>22 investigation in 2010 on behalf of where we did</p> <p>23 testing -- we did continuous courses to be collected,</p> <p>24 sample from material properties, and all that was used</p> <p>25 for seismic evaluation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 Those were the major questions that I was</p> <p>2 prepared to cover tonight. There may have been others,</p> <p>3 but we'll definitely be incorporating comments and</p> <p>4 suggestions in the FS RAP, so ...</p> <p>5 MR. YOUNGKIN: You said the groundwater</p> <p>6 monitoring was the same for all three alternatives. Is</p> <p>7 the ONM the same for all three alternatives too, or the</p> <p>8 long-term ONM? They were kind of grouped together in</p> <p>9 the wording that we were talking about.</p> <p>10 MR. FORTUNA: Yeah, I'd have to look at that</p> <p>11 because Chris designed it. I think the ONM frequency</p> <p>12 and approach is the same for all three alternatives, but</p> <p>13 the cost may be different because it's different to</p> <p>14 conduct a repair for a requirement for cover options,</p> <p>15 but I'd have to get back to you on that.</p> <p>16 MR. YOUNGKIN: Does that affect the cost of</p> <p>17 something?</p> <p>18 MS. FANELLI: I think that what Chris said</p> <p>19 last time was there was a difference in ONM cost with</p> <p>20 different alternatives, but in general, the more</p> <p>21 complicated the cover, the higher the ONM cost because</p> <p>22 it's more complicated repair than if it was a simple</p> <p>23 cover. So a soil cover would have lesser costs for</p> <p>24 repair than, say, a membrane or whatever the issue was,</p> <p>25 say, after a seismic event or something like that.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>	<p>1 MR. YOUNGKIN: So the wording in the text was</p> <p>2 pretty confusing about that stuff. So probably look at</p> <p>3 that when the ground work monitoring is looked at, too.</p> <p>4 MR. BERMAN: There was some discussion about</p> <p>5 this -- all the plan that involved escalation and</p> <p>6 thinking of that ballpark as being moot and downgrading</p> <p>7 it from the present plans and kind of looking at the</p> <p>8 remediation in a slightly different way. It was brought</p> <p>9 up by Doug, and I don't know whether that's been</p> <p>10 entertained at all, whether you were going to or whether</p> <p>11 there was any consideration of that, because it was not</p> <p>12 really any of the alternatives that were considered in</p> <p>13 FS.</p> <p>14 MS. FANELLI: The FS considered removal of the</p> <p>15 landfill. So this is in the FS. We did adjust the cost</p> <p>16 estimate for the removal to not necessarily bring back</p> <p>17 any of that fill only to stabilize the site, because</p> <p>18 that was incorporated -- the appropriate comments.</p> <p>19 MR. BERMAN: So that's in the FS now as</p> <p>20 revised numbers?</p> <p>21 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.</p> <p>22 MR. BERMAN: Was it depreciable?</p> <p>23 MS. FANELLI: 14.9 for the removal. So the</p> <p>24 excavation referral --</p> <p>25 MR. FORTUNA: I think the estimate was around</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>

<p>1 14.9. 2 MS. FANELLI: Right. 3 MR. FORTUNA: And then without that, which was 4 the clean -- it was about 13, 14. 5 MS. FANELLI: But, Sam, it's not remedy 6 removal; it's not bringing material back in. We are 7 removing. So that element -- that portion of it was not 8 discussed. 9 MR. BERMAN: Right. 10 MR. BOGGS: Have you done an analysis on the 11 kind of northern slope that's kind of steep to see if 12 that site would be stable? Would you maybe have to cut 13 back the slope in order to make it stable? We had a 14 similar situation at Landfill 10 where there was 15 previously no further action alternative. It was 16 discovered that they had to cut back the slope and 17 reduce the slope. 18 It seems that that would be an important 19 question and answer prior to going too far on the 20 design, if you have to redesign in order to make the 21 slope stable. It's a pretty steep slope on that end. 22 They had some significant erosion problems on that slope 23 in the past. Erosion got cut through there, so just an 24 idea that would be a crude element to evaluate prior to 25 getting too far down the design.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Again, Virginia is the project manager on 2 this, so any comments that are coming from me, it's just 3 like I'm a public person. I'm not involved as a 4 regulator on Landfill E any longer. 5 MR. FORTUNA: Yeah. I mean, I'm not prepared 6 to comment on the details of the design process because 7 we have Chris, who's our Geotech engineer, who is in the 8 process, and he's not here. 9 MR. BERMAN: You're saying that whatever slope 10 stabilization is going to be required, it's going to be 11 part of the design procedure anyway, so you're not 12 going -- it's not going to affect your decision-making 13 in the FS? 14 MR. FORTUNA: Right. 15 FACILITATOR KERN: Back to the cost estimate, 16 were there any other adjustments besides just the 17 reimportation of fill? The reason I ask is it seems 18 that sometimes the contingencies are based just on the 19 total cost. And so there's a multiplier on that, there 20 are construction management costs that are typically 21 kind of a multiplier. So by extracting that section of 22 work, it might have kind of a cascading effect on the 23 cost estimate. Just wondering if that was done? My 24 interest is seeing how low the total excavation cost 25 could be.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 MR. FORTUNA: I believe the cost estimate 2 revision included all factors related to build back up. 3 So it wasn't simply a materials cost or a trucking cost; 4 it was grading placement, compaction, all the things 5 that go along with it. And that was the only major 6 adjustment to the cost estimates that were provided in 7 the preliminary draft that you saw. There may have been 8 some minor revisions related to consistency of ground 9 work monitoring programs or things like that. 10 MR. BERMAN: I guess in terms of schedule, 11 refresh me again. So the FS is not being reviewed by 12 DTSC? 13 MS. FANELLI: We actually submitted the 14 revised draft today to DTSC, so they are taking a look 15 at it. And our hope is to get it out for public review 16 as soon as we can. 17 MR. BERMAN: So, for example, there's a point 18 Bob brought up about the placement of the wells, 19 upgrading if you find that they're really not in 20 position. You do a proper analysis, that's just going 21 to be part of the cost of the groundwater monitoring 22 program, to put new wells in there? 23 MS. FANELLI: I think that was the conclusion, 24 that we need additional wells, and that would be part of 25 the cost monitoring program.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>	<p>1 FACILITATOR KERN: I think there are some 2 questions in my mind about the configuration -- the 3 final configuration of the landfill with respect to 4 adding material or subtracting it or grading it or 5 moving it around, and dealing with the slope. And I 6 guess I'm not sure how that's being dealt with from just 7 looking at the plans in -- that we got in the draft. 8 So I'm kind of imagining different things and 9 wondering -- I guess I could ask: Is it just -- for the 10 preferred remedy, that being the soil cover, is it just 11 going to be 3 feet of soil on the top? Is that what's 12 being considered, or material out on the tow or cutting 13 back the tow, or are you we going to stabilize that 14 steep surface? 15 MR. FORTUNA: Well, the design hasn't been 16 finalized, so I can't speak to the specifics of that. 17 But I think under any cap remedy, there would probably 18 need to be some regrading -- or there will need to be 19 some regrading, compaction and perhaps moving of waste 20 in different areas. But I don't know what I can say 21 beyond that. We have to -- obviously, the landfill has 22 to be graded to promote runoff and things like that, so 23 there's different criteria. I'm not surprised you don't 24 have a good picture yet, based on what's presented in 25 the FS RAP. This is sort of the conceptual. This is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p>

<p>1 what it could look like.</p> <p>2 MS. FANELLI: I would hope that when we're in</p> <p>3 design -- and we hope to be in design soon, that we</p> <p>4 would then be able to also spend one of these evenings</p> <p>5 or days on the plan sessions and share that information</p> <p>6 with the preliminary draft rep and be able to answer</p> <p>7 some questions. It's premature right now because we</p> <p>8 don't actually have the answers for you.</p> <p>9 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess the reason I'm</p> <p>10 asking, or I'm pursuing this is I'm -- I was along for</p> <p>11 the whole process for Landfill 10, and I essentially --</p> <p>12 I agreed with the concept of taking material from the</p> <p>13 face and piling it up on the top to -- because that</p> <p>14 would mean a cost reduction X. Then it would provide a</p> <p>15 less steep parking lot. That was the thinking.</p> <p>16 And as I look at it now, I'm really astounded</p> <p>17 by this massive site of Landfill 10. So I wish I had</p> <p>18 been able to think through that more at the time and</p> <p>19 wonder if there were other things we could have done.</p> <p>20 That's all Monday morning quarterbacking, but it's --</p> <p>21 now we have another one coming up, and I'm expressing</p> <p>22 the -- I'm so hesitant to just say, "Well, let's do this</p> <p>23 general idea," and then we don't know what's going to</p> <p>24 be. That's kind of -- I'm really antsy about that at</p> <p>25 the moment because I can't even visualize what's going</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 to happen. I can't really comment -- you know, is it</p> <p>2 going to look funny in the end? Is it going -- I don't</p> <p>3 know. It could look great. I just feel like I know so</p> <p>4 little about the -- I obviously know the concept, soil</p> <p>5 cover cap. That's kind of all we know.</p> <p>6 I can also visualize removing it, and I really</p> <p>7 like that idea because it's all gone, and there's room</p> <p>8 for a ball field and everything is wonderful and there</p> <p>9 are birds. I mean, my visualization of that goes on and</p> <p>10 on, and there's creeks and maybe even the three deer</p> <p>11 that live at the Presidio might be bounding about,</p> <p>12 Bambies and coyotes. Sorry.</p> <p>13 So I'm just -- that's kind of out there for</p> <p>14 me, is the -- I'm feeling really -- sitting way back on</p> <p>15 getting excited about supporting something without</p> <p>16 having a little bit more of an idea of what it is. So</p> <p>17 there it is. You can't answer it, obviously.</p> <p>18 MR. BOGGS: I have one other question: Has</p> <p>19 any more work been done to evaluate the hydraulics at</p> <p>20 the base of the landfill in high grading periods?</p> <p>21 There's actually seep that comes out of the bottom of</p> <p>22 the landfill that's 50 gallons a minute. Just huge</p> <p>23 almost never runs any period of time, but certain high</p> <p>24 rain periods it literally is a stream. If you kept this</p> <p>25 without dealing with the hydraulics, you change your</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 whole seismic condition, et cetera.</p> <p>2 So I'm just curious if they've done any work</p> <p>3 to figure out how and why you have the hydraulics at the</p> <p>4 landfill that you do. It's actually quite an incredible</p> <p>5 increase in a very short period of time. It essentially</p> <p>6 does not run, and then becomes a large creek.</p> <p>7 MS. FANELLI: Actually, I think in Appendix A</p> <p>8 there's a whole analysis of the landfill, and what we</p> <p>9 basically determined is that there is a structure pipe</p> <p>10 that's completely curved, so it sort of fits the model</p> <p>11 you're describing. We believe it's a source of the</p> <p>12 purge water and that that issue will be remedied as part</p> <p>13 of the cap cover.</p> <p>14 MR. BOGGS: Just curious, how are you going to</p> <p>15 do that?</p> <p>16 MR. FORTUNA: We haven't gone into the design</p> <p>17 details of pipe closures, but there are certainly plans</p> <p>18 in place.</p> <p>19 MR. BOGGS: That's easy, but how do you</p> <p>20 relieve the hydraulic pressure?</p> <p>21 MR. FORTUNA: We believe the pipe is the</p> <p>22 source of the vast majority of the water into the</p> <p>23 landfill, and so during the --</p> <p>24 MR. BOGGS: The pipe is the source into the</p> <p>25 landfill that releases hundreds of gallons per minute?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>	<p>1 I'd like to see an engineering analysis that showed that</p> <p>2 because that's -- just doesn't seem physically possible</p> <p>3 that you have water flowing in, and then suddenly coming</p> <p>4 out 50 gallons a minute for a couple weeks.</p> <p>5 MR. FORTUNA: When you're talking about 50</p> <p>6 gallons a minute, you're talking about a seep?</p> <p>7 MR. BOGGS: In the high rain season, I'm</p> <p>8 sure -- lots of people have seen it. It becomes a</p> <p>9 stream. It's 3 feet deep of water coming out of that</p> <p>10 landfill at very high volume, very high capacity. A</p> <p>11 registered engineer has no concept of how that happened.</p> <p>12 Maybe it can be explained, but it doesn't make sense</p> <p>13 that that quantity of water should be flowing a pipe and</p> <p>14 then for weeks flow out of the same pipe.</p> <p>15 It's like there's a big reservoir there. If</p> <p>16 there is, that's another -- a big void that needs to be</p> <p>17 dealt with in that landfill. Perry hasn't talked to me</p> <p>18 about this landfill yet. Virginia hasn't, either. I</p> <p>19 have been historically on that landfill, cycles,</p> <p>20 investigations, analysis, et cetera. So there's a lot</p> <p>21 of information. There are things that have happened</p> <p>22 that maybe not everybody is aware of.</p> <p>23 FACILITATOR KERN: It's been talked a little</p> <p>24 bit, too, that there will be a creek along the side of</p> <p>25 that landfill, or some kind of diversion trench or</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>

<p>1 ditch. And the last, I guess, thing that we saw was 2 kind of a straight line on the map that showed that, and 3 that that's being discussed. I think was the last thing 4 that you said was maybe it's windy or -- I kind of went 5 back to the site and I looked, and it -- the edge of the 6 landfill kind of goes uphill into the forest. And I'm 7 just really wondering how far out in the forest that's 8 going to be put and how that would work. Is that being 9 discussed or thought about more?</p> <p>10 MS. FANELLI: When we get into the design, our 11 objectives are to reestablish the drainage on that 12 western side. And again, the design details, how we're 13 going to do that, how much of that edge is consolidated 14 so we can put the cap, put it in the appropriate swail 15 that will function to discharge all the water off the 16 landfill and allow for our aspiration to charge to the 17 plant as best we can, appropriately, so that it has a 18 natural -- and provides some habitat value.</p> <p>19 So, yes, we are -- when we dig into our 20 design, it's one of our primary design criteria or 21 objectives, is to make as natural a stream system as we 22 can, giving the restraints of the capping.</p> <p>23 MR. BERMAN: Are you thinking that the 24 landfill goes up into the forest itself?</p> <p>25 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, at the edge of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 landfill it goes up -- grading from the edge, and I'm -- 2 so I'm imagining either if it goes out into the forest, 3 we've got to cut down that grade or something. I 4 just can't visualize that part of it yet. I don't know 5 what's being considered. I don't know how we're going 6 to put a creek adjacent to a landfill. I don't know how 7 that is feasible. I definitely want there to be a 8 creek. I've been an advocate for this system for a good 9 18 years, but I don't know how that's going to work. It 10 just seems like a lot of the details are really 11 important.</p> <p>12 MR. BERMAN: This is the creek on the east 13 side?</p> <p>14 MS. FANELLI: West side.</p> <p>15 FACILITATOR KERN: West side.</p> <p>16 MR. BERMAN: Okay.</p> <p>17 MS. FANELLI: Well, as we get into design, it 18 is our desire to share that with you. We want to get 19 into design soon, but we can't really get into design 20 until we get the draft of FS RAP out on the street. So 21 our hope is to get some of those details out and prepare 22 to present them, even though we're moving at some risk, 23 but parallel to the review of the FS RAP.</p> <p>24 MS. KRAMMER: When do you anticipate getting 25 into the design, or when would you start construction?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 MS. FANELLI: We're looking to compress design 2 into a very short two and a half month period, and we 3 are looking to start -- in essence, we have started from 4 the standpoint internally. The Trust is looking at our 5 objectives, so Doug brought up the creek. We are trying 6 to make sure that we are setting up design standards for 7 ourselves that we can achieve the objectives of the VMP 8 and any other planning documents that pertain to that 9 site, and we think that we have some internal agreement 10 on that, and so we can -- we're positioned to move into 11 design quickly, based on the concepts that we have so 12 far and the concept grading that's in the FS RAP at this 13 point.</p> <p>14 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the things that I 15 brought up at the last meeting two weeks ago was this 16 idea of another alternative, and you've partially 17 answered that by saying you've adjusted the cost of the 18 total excavation work. I'm just wondering how I could 19 present something to the Trust for your consideration so 20 that all the other objectives could be considered?</p> <p>21 There's the recreational needs and the natural 22 resources, and perhaps even historic resources, that 23 maybe haven't really been articulated or brought forward 24 because some of them, at least, only occurred to me just 25 two weeks ago. So what would be the best forum to bring</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p>	<p>1 that forward to, as we're trying to decide on a remedy, 2 because I think that one of the roles of the restoration 3 advisory board is to consider the reuse in 4 decision-making.</p> <p>5 We're not here to decide the reuse, but to 6 consider what's being proposed. And if there could be a 7 change in the configuration of the reuse, that might 8 effect this remedy choice. So I'd like to do that in a 9 constructive way. Would I submit it to the Trust 10 generally, to the planning department, or -- what would 11 be a way to do that?</p> <p>12 MR. DEIS: I'm curious, what kind of schedule 13 on that site would necessitate a different kind of 14 remedy?</p> <p>15 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we're talking about a 16 creek next to the site of the landfill to meet that 17 objective, and we're talking about putting a ball field 18 on top of the cap. It would appear that you could -- 19 that you remove the material, you could get a creek more 20 in a natural position, not on fill material, and you 21 could still have the total ball field. So that's 22 something I don't know that, really, people have 23 considered yet.</p> <p>24 I think it's mostly been in people's minds 25 that a ball field would fit most easily on top of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p>

<p>1 landfill. But I brought some folks out there, I've 2 walked it out, I've kind of looked at it. You could fit 3 the ball field more to the -- slightly to the north, 4 where it would be lower after you removed all the 5 material and that's -- it would cost a little more, but 6 I kind of want people to be able to consider -- at least 7 consider that.</p> <p>8 We're talking about bringing in a huge amount 9 of fill material to act as a cap, and that we're going 10 to have to do ONM, we're going to have to monitor that, 11 maybe do repairs versus the alternative, which is a more 12 natural system, get the waste out of there, still create 13 a ball field, the esthetics could be amazing, much 14 different with a creek that was actually more in a 15 natural position.</p> <p>16 That's the kind of thing I would like to be 17 able to bring forward and, you know, have people look at 18 the difference in the cost. There would be a cost 19 challenge that, you know, maybe we can come up with some 20 alternatives for finding the money. I mean, it's 21 impossible these days to, you know, think about how that 22 could be, but it's a choice for many, many years to come 23 that we're approaching. And I would just like to be 24 able to have that be considered somehow, and, it could 25 be ultimately rejected.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 I'm just looking for the best form to -- that 2 if I made some drawings and I do some cost estimates, 3 because it's not really the role of the remediation 4 department to go through this exercise. Just trying to 5 bring some alternative to the Trust for consideration.</p> <p>6 MR. DEIS: Yeah. I think we would be 7 certainly open to hearing that because, certainly, you 8 got some thoughts and ideas of another approach we'd 9 like to hear. We probably ought to figure out a way of 10 sitting down with the right people that help kind of 11 work through what that would entail and what the cost 12 would be and what the impact would be on the schedule 13 and --</p> <p>14 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.</p> <p>15 MR. DEIS: And the cost, but think of a way of 16 doing that. So I'm going to see you tomorrow anyway, 17 right. So why don't we --</p> <p>18 FACILITATOR KERN: We'll bring it up. Thank 19 you. Other questions on Landfill E. I wonder if we 20 could circle back to some of the -- since we have a 21 little bit of time, to some of the sites that you 22 mentioned in your longer report.</p> <p>23 And actually, there is -- I read the report, 24 even though I didn't send you any questions, but I did 25 look and I noticed -- I don't know if it's new, I just</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 hadn't notice it before, maybe you've had it in there, 2 but there's a 2015 construction schedule.</p> <p>3 MS. FANELLI: The schedule shows that 4 enumerated sites are being completed, basically, by 5 2014. And unknown sites -- some of the unknown sites 6 have been kicked out, and we've done that so that we can 7 address the known sites, and the unknown sites are still 8 pretty much not known, and so, yes, it does show. How 9 real is that? I don't know because I don't really know 10 if any of those sites are going to require remediation 11 or not.</p> <p>12 FACILITATOR KERN: Any recollection of the 13 number, the universe of that, and we don't know, it was 14 on the order of several hundred? Is that still the 15 case, or is it --</p> <p>16 MS. FANELLI: I'd have to go back and do some 17 research to answer that. I know that the original list 18 was quite long. I know that there has been some work 19 done to screen them. I have not read or reviewed that 20 report, so I can't really answer how many potential 21 sites still need some type of evaluation.</p> <p>22 FACILITATOR KERN: I think the original list 23 was over 800, and my recollection is it kind of whittled 24 down into the 200 range, and then past that. I don't 25 know.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p>	<p>1 MS. FANELLI: I can ask Genevieve and find out 2 what that current status is. We're not working on those 3 miscellaneous -- what we call miscellaneous sites at 4 this point.</p> <p>5 FACILITATOR KERN: It just occurred to me that 6 just through horrible probability of the remediation 7 site, it is that one or two out of those might actually 8 require some potential, and hopefully not a lot if it's 9 beyond the expiration. So I just notice that that was 10 definitely outside of the policy.</p> <p>11 MS. FANELLI: We're actually aware of that 12 issue.</p> <p>13 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm sure. Let's see. I 14 had another -- oh, the Baker Beach 1 site -- or 1A, and 15 Merchant Road and Baker Beach 2. I think you mentioned 16 you're working with the park service on those. Can you 17 give us at least some idea of what the issues are, and 18 the reason I'm asking is years ago there was a 19 discussion around Landfill 8 and 10 that went on for 20 three years, that we asked about, that we could never 21 find out what was happening. And then all that kind of 22 went away and something completely different was done, 23 so I'm just kind of checking in to see where -- what the 24 issues are around those sites. What's the nature of the 25 discussion, if you can tell me.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p>

<p>1 MS. FANELLI: I think we're just working 2 through the normal circuit process. I don't think 3 there's any specific issues. We are working through an 4 assessment, the RI, which I think was approved, and the 5 FS and part of the Area A away. We share that in terms 6 of the Area A site with the park service before we issue 7 it.</p> <p>8 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would say there are some 9 issues that we're working through with respect to your 10 proposal: The exposure assessments; your risk 11 assessment; and your discussion of wanting to do 12 site-specific background calculations, which would 13 change the effective cleanup numbers, and things like 14 that. Those are fairly big issues, which would 15 ultimately potentially change the cleanup level for that 16 site.</p> <p>17 MS. FANELLI: We have been talking about 18 site-specific and Presidio-specific. Those are 19 conversations that have involved park service and the 20 Trust.</p> <p>21 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's what I said. Those 22 are the things we are talking about.</p> <p>23 MS. FANELLI: Those are the things we are 24 talking about, but that's for that process, before we 25 issue documents for public consumption. Part of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 Area A, we're working with the park service.</p> <p>2 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. I was part of the 3 Merchant Road discussion for a while. That's just gone 4 away. So I'm just trying to check on where that --</p> <p>5 MS. FANELLI: I think it's the data report 6 that was issued to DTSC. I think that's probably -- so 7 the last data report for Merchant Road is out there, I 8 believe.</p> <p>9 MR. ULLENSVANG: The last data report, I think 10 there may be some discussion there about the 11 appropriateness of different background levels for pHs 12 that might not be on -- or out to the --</p> <p>13 MS. FANELLI: Yeah, actually, we haven't. My 14 understanding is that the concern is eco-numbers and 15 whether or not there is a health risk for pHs.</p> <p>16 MR. ULLENSVANG: And if there is an urban 17 background, that would be applicable to that site?</p> <p>18 MS. FANELLI: Yes.</p> <p>19 FACILITATOR KERN: Did you say an "urban 20 background"?</p> <p>21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. The proposal is, the 22 appropriate background level for pH in the site may be 23 one that's derived by PG&E and some of their consultants 24 for urban manufacturer gas plant sites.</p> <p>25 MS. FANELLI: I think there is a background</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 study that DTSC brought to the Trust, Army and park 2 service's attention in discussions that establishes 3 background levels for pHs, that was done in conjunction 4 with PG&E.</p> <p>5 MR. ULLENSVANG: And that was done 6 specifically for urban manufacturer gas plant sites and 7 looking at where you might find the edge of a cleanup at 8 one of those sites.</p> <p>9 MS. FANELLI: Well, actually, I'm not prepared 10 to discuss what the details of that report are because 11 the truth is, I haven't read that, but one of the issues 12 we're looking at is if there is an appropriate 13 background level, but I think in addition, just based on 14 the data we have, there's some question as to given a 15 recreational use whether or not who --</p> <p>16 MR. ULLENSVANG: The assumptions for the risk 17 assessment, you've proposed a recreational user that 18 might only spend 30 minutes on that site as opposed to 19 what a reasonable maximum person might spend on that 20 site doing other recreational --</p> <p>21 MS. FANELLI: The Trust hasn't proposed 22 anything about Merchant Road at this point.</p> <p>23 MR. ULLENSVANG: But that's a 1A site.</p> <p>24 MS. FANELLI: They've reached 1A. They're 25 looking at, based on discussions, some ways to look at</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p>	<p>1 site-specific exposure scenarios. Yes, so we are 2 looking at that. And park service is reviewing that 3 information.</p> <p>4 FACILITATOR KERN: A question that I asked at 5 the committee meeting. I noticed a document, I think on 6 confirmation sampling for Landfill 2, Fill Site 1, and I 7 raised the possibility in looking at the data. There 8 might be a hot spot. Do you know if DTSC is looking at 9 that?</p> <p>10 MS. MAJHAIL: I think that's a question for 11 Medy.</p> <p>12 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.</p> <p>13 MS. MAJHAIL: I will take that question back 14 to her and probably have her respond to it.</p> <p>15 FACILITATOR KERN: And I wanted to verify one 16 thing that you said about Mountain Lake. Were you 17 saying the decision documents you were hoping to get by 18 the end of the calendar year, or do --</p> <p>19 MS. FANELLI: I would like to have the 20 decision document, the RAB, finalized by the end of the 21 calendar year, yes.</p> <p>22 And that schedule is what we show in the 23 quarterly report. The idea is we would finish those 24 planning documents this calendar year, design next year, 25 and we would be in construction in 2013.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>

<p>1 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you have an idea of the 2 alternatives for the cleanup, the different dredging of 3 things that you're thinking about?</p> <p>4 MS. FANELLI: We've begun to look at those 5 alternatives, yes, and we don't have a document yet 6 to -- it's issued, but we have looked at mechanical 7 versus dry dredging alternatives.</p> <p>8 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the things that 9 occurs to me with this site is how visible and how much 10 attention it would draw. It's just going to be a very 11 significant public input-type thing, and I think I would 12 just throw out for your consideration that getting 13 people warmed to the ideas that you have, whether the 14 possibilities and getting them thinking, visualizing 15 would be incredibly helpful.</p> <p>16 MS. FANELLI: We agree. I know DTSC reported, 17 or Denise reported last month that DTSC has done some 18 outreach with the agencies.</p> <p>19 MS. MAJHAIL: Yes. DTSC is trying to set a 20 meeting in January -- January 20th. And the agencies 21 that were involved are interested in the remediation 22 work. They were all together and discussed about 23 Mountain Lake. Besides that, we are also aggressively 24 doing some public outreach with some organizations with 25 Mountain Lake and other organizations. We scheduled a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 meeting mid-month with a few key players here, and are 2 planning to get the outreach.</p> <p>3 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Excellent. I just 4 want to draw attention to the difference between 5 compassion that might be exhibited by some of the 6 volunteers. They've lived and gone to Mountain Lake for 7 decades, highly interested and, you know, very intimate 8 with the site versus -- and I don't want to at all 9 characterize the agency interaction, but maybe it would 10 be more technical -- what's possible, this is just going 11 to be such a huge deal, I think, if the lake were 12 drained, for example, under one scenario. So I'm just 13 encouraging early and often just what possibilities 14 people are considering.</p> <p>15 MS. BLUM: Just as a suggestion, I know this 16 would be a little bit unusual for you, but you may want 17 to work with the Public Probations Department of the 18 Trust in order to be able to communicate with the 19 neighborhood in their kind of terminology in a way that 20 would be appropriate for the Trust and sort of less 21 scientific. They're just dealing with a lot of 22 controversy.</p> <p>23 MS. MAJHAIL: You're talking about their 24 internal affairs? We've been already coordinating with 25 that department already, and whatever outreaching we'll</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 be doing, they'll be -- we'll be coordinating with them. 2 Besides the meeting this month, we're actually planning 3 to do some public workshops, as well, for the 4 neighborhood of Mountain Lake. So we understand that 5 it's in the high priority. Public outreach is a high 6 priority on our list, too, but thanks for your 7 suggestion.</p> <p>8 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you. Thanks for 9 considering my -- those questions. Any other 10 thoughts --</p> <p>11 MS. BLUM: I couldn't hear very well over 12 there, but Bob Boggs asked the question about the 13 potential seismic testing of the slope in Landfill E. 14 What was the answer?</p> <p>15 MR. FORTUNA: We have -- I think the answer 16 was that we have -- there's a bunch of existing data on 17 material properties. We've conducted an initial 18 investigation in 2010 to do testing, collect physical 19 samples for testing, and all of that existing in recent 20 data will be used in the stability seismic design.</p> <p>21 MS. BLUM: That was on the northeast slope; is 22 that right?</p> <p>23 MR. BOGGS: North. Somewhere east and west.</p> <p>24 MS. BLUM: Wherever it's appropriate. Thank 25 you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>	<p>1 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm not sure I'm going to 2 get your name right, if your first or your last name is 3 Perry.</p> <p>4 MR. MYERS: First.</p> <p>5 FACILITATOR KERN: First. Perry, I wanted to 6 say I've noticed that you're here, but did we answer any 7 questions you might have, or I'm not --</p> <p>8 MR. MYERS: Mostly listening today. I'm 9 fairly new to the project. I'm with our engineering 10 services section, so I'm helping individuals on more of 11 the technical things. I'm actually working with Bob on 12 some other parts, so I kind of -- so this is my first 13 RAB meeting so mostly I've just been trying to stay 14 quiet, listen for the feel of how things go, but yeah, 15 you know, I'm fairly proactive. As far as if I have 16 questions, you'll hear from me, and you won't have 17 trouble hearing my voice.</p> <p>18 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Well, welcome 19 to the meeting, and thank you for being here. Any other 20 questions?</p> <p>21 MS. MAJHAIL: I need to make just a quick 22 announcement that DTSC received the draft FS RAP today 23 and will be reviewing it. But I want to make clear one 24 thing, that once we start the public comment period, any 25 RAB meeting or any meeting where public is invited</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>

<p>1 during the public comment period is considered at a 2 public meeting, so DTSC will be cutting back on 3 participation during that time.</p> <p>4 So if there is -- because if there's any RAB 5 meeting or any other meetings that would be during that 6 public comment period, we probably wouldn't be attending 7 because that puts us to the public meeting, which we 8 will be conducting anyway.</p> <p>9 FACILITATOR KERN: In the past, we have 10 occasionally had a RAB meeting ahead of the public 11 meeting to schedule same days. So we would have people 12 at -- be able to attend both meetings. I'll just throw 13 that out there as a possibility. We'd be open to 14 scheduling our meeting to work with your meeting, if you 15 want to do that.</p> <p>16 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. It all depends when we 17 start the public comment period. So depending on that 18 date. We will come up with a date for the public 19 meeting where we are all available on that date as well, 20 but I will definitely keep that suggestion in mind.</p> <p>21 FACILITATOR KERN: Just to clarify, maybe, one 22 thing that you said. Would the RAB meeting, if we had 23 one separate from your public meeting, that would not 24 necessarily go on the record as part of the Landfill E 25 comments, or would it?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 MS. MAJHAIL: You know, if you have a RAB 2 meeting, and we're not involved in it, that's just a RAB 3 meeting. But if we show up and we attend that meeting, 4 it becomes like a public meeting. So that's why if 5 there's any other meeting during that time frame, we'll 6 cut back our participation during that time.</p> <p>7 FACILITATOR KERN: That's good to know. I 8 mean, hopefully everyone has heard that, that we may 9 need to go to two meetings if that's how the schedule 10 works, or maybe we'll be able to work it out.</p> <p>11 Any other things from DTSC tonight?</p> <p>12 MS. MAJHAIL: That will be all, pretty much.</p> <p>13 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Agnes is not 14 here --</p> <p>15 MR. YOUNGKIN: She sent me an e-mail. She has 16 a cold.</p> <p>17 FACILITATOR KERN: Any new business? Any 18 public comment? I think we have a number of action 19 items to follow up on, these large number of sites that 20 we're tracking. And are there any other items before we 21 close?</p> <p>22 Without objection, the meeting is adjourned. 23 Thanks, everyone, for coming out tonight. 24 (Meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.) 25 ---o0o---</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) 2) 3 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)</p> <p>4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the 5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the 6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a 7 full, true, and complete record of said matter.</p> <p>8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or 9 attorney for either of any of the parties in the 10 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way 11 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said 12 action.</p> <p>13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my 14 hand this _____ day of _____, 2010. 15 16 17 18 19 20 SARAH GOEKLER, CSR No. 13446 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>	

A	advisory 1:1 5:3,12 35:7 53:3 advocate 51:8 affairs 63:24 affect 26:21 40:16 43:12 agencies 62:18,20 agency 4:9 37:22 63:9 agenda 4:1,4,15 6:10,10 7:17 aggressive 22:11 aggressively 62:23 Agnes 4:11 9:5,11 9:12 18:7 24:6 67:13 ago 17:17 52:15,25 57:18 agree 62:16 agreed 46:12 agreed-upon 21:20 agreement 26:5 52:9 ahead 17:19 66:10 air 20:6 allow 50:16 allowable 29:1 alternative 7:14 34:15 35:12 37:13 42:15 52:16 54:11 55:5 alternatives 17:1 25:2 34:13,19 35:3 36:18 37:8 37:14 40:6,7,12 40:20 41:12 54:20 62:2,5,7 amazing 54:13 AMEC 16:20 18:16 amount 13:9 22:1 28:25 54:8 amounts 28:16 analyses 39:5 analysis 16:5,21 37:2,3 42:10 44:20 48:8 49:1 49:20 and/or 39:2 Angela 25:1 anion 30:19 31:17 anions 31:14 33:24 announcement 65:22 announcements 4:5 6:22 answer 7:6 8:10 20:19 21:15 29:2 31:6 34:4,7,17 35:13 42:19 46:6 47:17 56:17,20 64:14,15 65:6 answered 52:17 answers 29:13 46:8 anticipate 36:5 51:24 anticipated 29:8 anticipating 14:19 antsy 46:24 anymore 10:21 anyway 43:11 55:16 66:8 appear 53:18 appendix 35:23 48:7 applicable 59:17 application 35:2 applied 35:1 36:9 36:10 apply 20:21 approach 31:10 37:4 40:12 55:8 approaching 54:23 appropriate 31:5 31:18 33:1 41:18 50:14 59:22 60:12 63:20 64:24 appropriately 50:17 appropriateness 59:11 approval 4:4 24:8 approvals 24:8 approved 17:16 58:4 archives 9:7 area 15:11,20 20:2 39:7 58:5,6 59:1 areas 36:7 45:20 arguments 33:16 arm 16:14 Army 9:23 11:12 11:14 12:12,14,16 12:18 16:13,14,17 25:21,24,25 26:4 26:5 60:1 Army's 9:4 articulated 52:23 ascribe 11:9 ash 26:3 asked 28:3 57:20 61:4 64:12 asking 7:22 21:11 46:10 57:18 aspiration 50:16 assessment 21:16 22:1 58:4,11 60:17 assessments 21:4 58:10 associated 30:24 36:22,23 assume 6:12 assuming 27:19 assumptions 60:16 astounded 46:16 attend 66:12 67:3 ATTENDEES 2:1 attending 66:6 attention 60:2 62:10 63:4 attorney 68:9 available 18:16 66:19 avenue 26:6 aware 24:5 49:22 57:11	B back 9:24 11:22 19:17 21:21 23:6 24:15 25:25 26:6 29:25 30:21 34:19 35:3 38:8 40:15 41:16 42:6,13,16 43:15 44:2 45:13 47:14 50:5 55:20 56:16 61:13 66:2 67:6 background 58:12 59:11,17,20,22,25 60:3,13 bad 26:8 Baker 8:16,22 12:11 13:8 15:23 16:3 21:5 23:20 23:25 24:19,19 25:20 57:14,15 balance 38:4 balancing 35:25 ball 47:8 53:17,21 53:25 54:3,13 ballpark 21:10 41:6 Bambies 47:12 base 47:20 based 16:21 19:6 31:16 43:18 45:24 52:11 60:13,25 basically 8:13 10:7 21:2 25:11 48:9 56:4 basis 27:3 basket 24:6 Battery-Howe 16:19 Beach 8:16,22 12:11 13:8 15:23 16:4 21:5 23:20 24:1,19,20 25:21 57:14,15 bedrock 34:9
----------	--	--

beginning 5:2 21:4 begun 62:4 behalf 39:22 believe 16:5 19:19 30:6 44:1 48:11 48:21 59:8 Berman 2:11 5:15 5:15 7:14,22 9:21 10:14,19,23 11:1 11:24 12:2,6,16 12:19,22 14:3,8 14:21,24 19:15 22:17,24 23:12 25:20 26:8 28:12 29:3,16 32:6 34:3 36:12,16 37:16 39:16 41:4,19,22 42:9 43:9 44:10 44:17 50:23 51:12 51:16 best 14:3 29:20 50:17 52:25 55:1 better 14:18 17:11 19:9 20:22 26:15 39:6 beyond 45:21 57:9 bid 27:9 28:8 bidding 27:10 bids 28:10 big 49:15,16 58:14 bigger 20:2 biggest 23:14 birds 47:9 bit 8:4 13:17 15:3 16:3,24 17:25 22:10 32:2 35:4 36:14 37:8 38:23 47:16 49:24 55:21 63:16 Blum 2:6 6:7,7 8:1 63:15 64:11,21,24 board 1:1 4:12 5:3 5:12 53:3 Bob 2:14 5:18 44:18 64:12 65:11	Bob's 34:4 Boggs 2:14 5:18,18 19:21 31:20 32:3 33:2,12 37:7 42:10 47:18 48:14 48:19,24 49:7 64:12,23 bottom 36:10 47:21 bought 26:7 bounding 47:11 breakdown 11:24 12:24 Brian 2:9 5:16 bring 41:16 52:25 54:17 55:5,18 bringing 42:6 54:8 brought 7:14 41:8 44:18 52:5,15,23 54:1 60:1 budget 11:7 14:4 14:20,21 22:21 24:14,15,17 25:17 budgets 14:7,12,14 build 44:2 building 1:12 3:3 17:15,17,24 22:18 26:3 buildings 10:3 21:2 21:6,17 22:2,4,13 bunch 64:16 business 4:5,13 6:22 67:17	48:13 50:14 53:18 54:9 capacity 49:10 capital 22:22 capping 50:22 caption 68:10 captured 19:5 27:4 27:6 carbon 20:5,7 cares 36:24 carry 14:12,13 carrying 25:15 cascading 43:22 case 19:20 56:15 cases 22:6 category 25:10 cation 30:19 31:16 cations 31:14 33:24 cause 29:10 68:11 CERCLA 8:11 9:1 12:24,25 24:1 certain 27:7,20 47:23 certainly 18:19 48:17 55:7,7 certification 15:8 certify 68:4,8 cetera 18:12 33:25 48:1 49:20 challenge 54:19 chance 14:9 change 25:6,14 27:25 47:25 53:7 58:13,15 changed 28:4 32:22 changes 31:5,19 characterization 16:6,22 31:16 characterize 63:9 charge 50:16 check 59:4 checking 57:23 Cheever 2:12 21:9 21:18 22:16 33:10 chemistry 31:13	Chief 2:15 choice 53:8 54:22 chose 37:4 chosen 35:21 CHP 15:13 Chris 7:4 40:11,18 43:7 chunk 12:11 circle 55:20 circuit 58:2 city 39:8 claim 12:11 claims 11:15 12:8,9 12:13 clarify 66:21 clause 27:19 clay 38:11,13 clean 10:7 29:22 42:4 cleanup 58:13,15 60:7 62:2 cleanups 14:1 28:13 clear 65:23 close 10:16,17 14:5 29:14 67:21 closed 9:13 closely 15:15 Closing 4:16 closure 9:12,13,18 10:9 21:3 24:2 closures 48:17 Club 1:12 3:3 cold 67:16 collect 20:4 64:18 collected 19:12 20:2 39:10,23 collecting 20:8 come 7:11 11:22,25 14:6 20:9 25:17 29:4,25 36:17 54:19,22 66:18 comes 6:20 47:21 coming 43:2 46:21 49:3,9 67:23	commenced 3:5 comment 4:14 18:7 38:1 43:6 47:1 65:24 66:1,6,17 67:18 commenting 23:23 comments 6:16 7:8 7:25 11:10 40:3 41:18 43:2 66:25 commit 17:12 committee 4:6 6:23 6:24 7:10 30:7 61:5 communicate 63:18 community 5:11,14 5:15,17 6:3,7 7:7 compaction 44:4 45:19 Company 2:13 5:22 comparing 36:18 comparison 36:1,3 37:13 compassion 63:5 competitive 27:11 compilation 8:22 complete 11:13,18 13:2,6 14:4,17,19 15:14 17:8 23:19 23:24 39:6,14 68:7 completed 8:15 9:10 13:11 15:10 21:25 22:9 24:23 28:3 35:22 56:4 completely 48:10 57:22 completing 8:11 14:1 completion 11:7 13:21 15:4,7 complicated 32:19 40:21,22 compress 52:1
---	---	--	---	--

concept 7:15 35:9 46:12 47:4 49:11 52:12 concepts 52:11 conceptual 38:5 45:25 concern 19:25 34:4 59:14 concerned 29:20 concerns 30:11 conclusion 44:23 conclusions 9:10 condition 48:1 conduct 40:14 conducted 64:17 conducting 8:13 66:8 configuration 45:2 45:3 53:7 confirmation 61:6 confused 11:1 confusing 41:2 conjunction 60:3 conservancy 15:20 conservative 14:12 26:12,18 consider 11:17 31:17 53:3,6 54:6 54:7 considerably 25:23 consideration 41:11 52:19 55:5 62:12 considered 9:3 36:2 38:18 41:12,14 45:12 51:5 52:20 53:23 54:24 66:1 considering 39:13 63:14 64:9 consistency 36:9 44:8 consistent 35:2 consolidated 50:13 constituents 31:11 construction 8:12	13:16 15:7,16 17:22,25 23:18 43:20 51:25 56:2 61:25 constructive 53:9 consultant 5:22 24:25 consultants 5:8 6:2 59:23 consumption 58:25 contains 24:22 contaminants 19:7 24:22 contaminate 30:19 contingencies 14:13,14,22 15:5 26:13 27:7 43:18 contingency 25:16 25:17 continue 24:12 continuing 8:21 9:15 23:14 continuous 39:23 contract 26:22 27:18 28:6 contractor 28:3 contractors 27:15 contracts 27:25 contributed 12:19 Control 4:10,12 controversy 63:22 conversations 58:19 coordinating 63:24 64:1 copy 16:9 18:5 30:5 correct 14:5 41:21 correctly 18:21 cosmetic 22:25 cost 11:13,18 12:24 14:17 25:3,5,9 27:8 28:13,16 29:4 36:16 37:5,9 40:13,16,19,21 41:15 43:15,19,23	43:24 44:1,3,3,6 44:21,25 46:14 52:17 54:5,18,18 55:2,11,15 costs 13:1,6,16,19 13:19 14:4 25:13 26:15,21 27:3,4 27:14,17,20 28:21 28:25 29:10,12 40:23 43:20 cost-wise 8:4 counsel 68:8 count 28:25 COUNTY 68:2 couple 19:22 24:14 49:4 course 15:11 courses 39:23 cover 10:5 13:7 29:12 40:2,14,21 40:23,23 45:10 47:5 48:13 covered 11:20,21 28:23 29:5 coyotes 47:12 co-chair 4:6 5:14 create 54:12 creek 48:6 49:24 51:6,8,12 52:5 53:16,19 54:14 creeks 47:10 criteria 35:1,5,25 36:3,9,11 37:5,6,9 37:12,15,20,20,24 39:9,13 45:23 50:20 critical 36:11 crude 42:24 CSR 1:20 3:4 68:20 curious 32:11 33:12,20 48:2,14 53:12 current 11:6 12:24 20:10 57:2 currently 8:16	20:24 curvated 48:10 cut 42:12,16,23 51:3 67:6 cutting 45:12 66:2 cycles 49:19 C.HG 2:18 <hr/> D <hr/> data 8:21,23 13:10 16:4,6,7,21,21 23:24 30:22 31:15 31:23 32:1,24 33:8,23 34:7 39:9 39:21 59:5,7,9 60:14 61:7 64:16 64:20 date 6:25 12:8 13:18 17:4 28:11 29:13 66:18,18,19 day 68:14 days 39:21 46:5 54:21 66:11 deal 63:11 dealing 28:12 45:5 47:25 63:21 dealt 45:6 49:17 decades 63:7 December 8:10 decide 37:12 53:1,5 decided 23:6 decision 17:19 22:4 36:13,13,15 61:17 61:20 decision-making 43:12 53:4 decrease 25:9 deemed 9:6 deep 19:15,19,20 49:9 deepest 19:18 deer 47:10 definitely 40:3 51:7 57:10 66:20 degrees 19:3 Deis 2:15 5:23	22:20 23:8 53:12 55:6,15 denied 28:4 Denise 4:10 62:17 department 4:10 29:19 53:10 55:4 63:17,25 depending 26:25 66:17 depends 15:3 32:10 66:16 depreciable 41:22 derived 59:23 describe 21:12 described 16:4 describing 48:11 descriptions 38:10 design 15:15 23:15 26:25 31:8 34:23 36:8 38:17,18 39:5,9,13 42:20 42:25 43:6,11 45:15 46:3,3 48:16 50:10,12,20 50:20 51:17,19,19 51:25 52:1,6,11 61:24 64:20 designed 40:11 desire 51:18 detail 12:15 13:2 31:23 32:2 33:8 34:7 35:4 38:7,24 details 19:9,24 31:8 34:8,22 43:6 48:17 50:12 51:10 51:21 60:10 determine 9:8 determined 10:10 48:9 develop 17:3,21 32:16 developing 17:10 development 23:5 diesel 27:3,14 differed 34:23
---	---	--	--	---

difference 40:19 54:18 63:4 differences 30:23 32:9 different 12:10 14:25 30:16 33:20 34:10,13,15 35:13 39:4 40:13,13,20 41:8 45:8,20,23 53:13 54:14 57:22 59:11 62:2 differently 15:2 difficult 37:3 difficulties 20:3 dig 50:19 direct 36:6 direction 33:20 disagreements 16:15 discharge 50:15 discovered 42:16 discuss 7:11 60:10 discussed 6:11 7:16 42:8 50:3,9 62:22 discussion 4:4 6:13 41:4 57:19,25 58:11 59:3,10 68:5 discussions 4:7 17:13 34:21 38:21 60:2,25 district 13:25 disturbed 23:10 ditch 50:1 diversion 49:25 document 9:9 13:22 23:22 35:7 35:9 36:8 39:7,15 61:5,20 62:5 documentation 10:9,11 14:2 21:3 24:3,4 30:22 documented 9:19 documents 9:8 17:9 23:19 27:2 31:9	38:9,11,15 52:8 58:25 61:17,24 doing 13:8 14:15 16:21 39:16 55:16 60:20 62:24 64:1 dollars 29:10 Doug 2:3 4:3 5:11 7:14 19:25 41:9 52:5 downgrade 30:15 downgrading 41:6 draft 7:2 8:15,18 15:23 16:1 23:17 23:20 30:5 34:21 35:24 44:7,14 45:7 46:6 51:20 65:22 drainage 50:11 drained 63:12 draw 62:10 63:4 drawings 55:2 dredging 62:2,7 drip 14:1 driven 24:19 driver 25:5 drops 18:12 dry 62:7 DTSC 2:14,16,17 2:19 5:18 6:4,5,6 7:5 9:18 13:13 15:12 16:10 17:4 17:11,16 23:22 35:7 36:25 44:12 44:14 59:6 60:1 61:8 62:16,17,19 65:22 66:2 67:11 DTSC's 35:6	63:13 easily 53:25 east 13:25 51:12 64:23 easy 48:19 economic 36:21,22 economics 36:19 eco-numbers 59:14 edge 50:5,13,25 51:1 60:7 edits 15:9 Edward 2:7 effect 43:22 53:8 effective 58:13 Eileen 2:4 4:8 5:24 21:9 either 18:22 49:18 51:2 68:9 EKI 15:14 31:24 38:10 electricity 18:22 19:1 20:16 electrode 19:1 electrodes 18:25 20:14,21 element 42:7,24 elements 18:2 eligible 28:17,20 embarrassing 7:23 encouraging 63:13 ended 8:10,11 endorsed 28:23 endorses 28:18 ends 36:21 energy 20:15 26:21 27:19 engineer 7:4 43:7 49:11 engineering 17:1 27:1 49:1 65:9 engineers 27:1 engineer's 14:17 entail 55:11 entertained 41:10 enumerated 28:21	56:4 environment 29:23 35:16 39:12 environmental 35:13 equipment 18:11 erosion 42:22,23 escalated 26:10 escalation 28:1,3,9 41:5 essence 10:4 52:3 essentially 35:11 46:11 48:5 establishes 60:2 esthetics 54:13 estimate 11:7,19 14:17 25:10,21 26:11 41:16,25 43:15,23 44:1 estimated 11:13 estimates 25:3 28:14 44:6 55:2 estimating 26:18 et 18:12 33:25 48:1 49:20 evaluate 42:24 47:19 evaluated 36:25 evaluating 37:8 evaluation 8:22 11:7 17:1 23:25 31:25 33:8 35:10 35:21,22,24 36:6 37:10 39:14,25 56:21 evaluations 39:2 evenings 46:4 event 40:25 everybody 49:22 evidence 9:9 exact 19:24 25:18 examine 36:20 example 28:2 37:20 44:17 63:12 excavation 41:24	43:24 52:18 exceed 27:20,21 Excellent 63:3 excited 47:15 exercise 55:4 exhibited 63:5 exist 9:22 10:4,8,11 10:12,24 27:25 existed 10:3,25 existing 13:10 16:21 30:22 37:15 64:16,19 expect 28:7 expend 29:10 expiration 57:9 explain 36:14 explained 49:12 explosive 19:12 exposed 18:1 exposure 58:10 61:1 expressed 30:11 expressing 46:21 extent 24:24 29:9 exterior 22:5 extracting 43:21 e-mail 67:15
F				
face 46:13 faces 5:9 Facilitator 2:3 4:3 5:1,20 6:8,17 7:13 7:18,24 11:4 18:19 19:10 20:12 29:25 43:15 45:1 46:9 49:23 50:25 51:15 52:14 53:15 55:14,18 56:12,22 57:5,13 59:2,19 61:4,12,15 62:1,8 63:3 64:8 65:1,5 65:18 66:9,21 67:7,13,17 facing 27:17 fact 36:18				

factor 26:20 36:21 36:22	54:13	Fortuna 2:18 5:23 6:1,1 7:3 30:4	34:22 38:21 40:20 46:23	51:5,9 54:9,10 55:16 56:10 62:10 63:10 65:1
factors 32:20 36:16 44:2	figure 23:7 48:3 55:9	31:22 32:5,13 33:6 34:6 37:18	generally 53:10 generate 19:2,3	Golden 1:12 3:2
fair 13:8 21:25	fill 8:12 13:15 14:13 16:19 23:15	39:19 40:10 41:25 42:3 43:5,14 44:1	Genevieve 57:1	good 6:8,23 7:5,6 7:13 21:14 22:1
fairly 14:12 22:14 58:14 65:9,15	25:8 27:10 41:17 43:17 53:20 54:9	45:15 48:16,21 49:5 64:15	Geomatrix 16:20	23:12 24:6 26:24 27:11,11 38:10
fall 13:21 24:23	61:6	forum 52:25	Geosyntec 2:18 6:1 6:13 7:2 39:21	45:24 51:8 65:18 67:7,13
famous 7:22	final 13:6 23:15 25:19 45:3	forward 16:10,17 17:14 23:14 33:1	Geotech 43:7	gotten 33:7 34:7
Fanelli 2:4 4:8 5:24 5:24 6:14,18 7:20	finalize 8:17 23:15 finalized 14:16 45:16 61:20	52:23 53:1 54:17	Geotechnical 7:4	grab 21:24
7:25 9:23 10:17 10:20,25 11:3,6	financial 29:19	fourth 6:25 7:10	getting 29:14 32:22 38:6 42:25 47:15	grade 51:3
12:1,4,9,18,21,23 14:5,11,23 15:2	find 7:18 15:17 38:4 44:19 57:1	frame 18:10 67:5	51:24 62:12,14	graded 15:11 45:22
18:24 19:14,17 20:19 21:14,19	57:21 60:7	Francisco 1:12 3:3 5:3 68:2	give 8:3 17:24 18:14 25:18 28:5	grading 14:15 23:15 25:19 44:4
22:18 23:1,11,13 26:1,10,24 27:23	finding 54:20	frequency 40:11	30:10 35:15 57:17	45:4 47:20 51:1 52:12
28:18 29:9,18 30:2 36:14,25	finish 25:19 61:23 finished 14:6	FS 8:18 13:22 35:1 35:5,24 37:2 38:2	given 60:14	gravities 35:19
40:18 41:14,21,23 42:2,5 44:13,23	first 8:7,10,12,23 10:22 11:15,16	39:3,4,6,11,15 40:4 41:13,14,15	giving 50:22	great 5:7 6:17 20:11 21:18 34:7
46:2 48:7 50:10 51:14,17 52:1	13:5,16 16:8 20:3 22:5 30:14 35:13	41:19 43:13 44:11 45:25 51:20,23	Gloria 2:10 5:16	38:24 47:3
56:3,16 57:1,11 58:1,17,23 59:5	65:2,4,5,12	52:12 58:5 65:22	go 5:10 10:6 11:22 16:6 17:19 18:9	greatest 13:4
59:13,18,25 60:9 60:21,24 61:19	fiscal 8:7	fuel 27:3,17,20	18:17 19:15,21 20:16 21:24 24:15	green 34:25 35:5,6 35:10,19 36:7,19
62:4,16	fit 53:25 54:2	full 68:7	26:6 28:16 30:1 33:24 35:12 38:8	37:9
far 21:10,13 33:18 33:24 42:19,25	fits 48:10	fully 25:16 30:10	44:5 55:4 56:16 65:14 66:24 67:9	GREM 35:10,22 36:6
50:7 52:12 65:15	fixed 14:24	function 50:15	goal 17:7	ground 18:24 19:2 41:3 44:8
Farres 4:11	flexibility 17:25	funding 11:16	GOEKLER 1:20 3:4 68:20	groundwater 19:21 20:13,14,17 30:14
fast 17:10	flip 25:12	funds 29:8	goes 18:10 29:4 33:19 47:9 50:6	30:15,16,20,24,24 31:9,13,24 32:17
fast-paced 17:10	flow 49:14	funny 47:2	50:24 51:1,2	40:5 44:21
feasible 51:7	flowing 49:3,13	further 9:3,17 42:15 68:8	going 7:8 16:2 17:18 18:1 19:11	group 10:24
February 30:6,8	focus 24:1	future 17:7 22:23 23:5	19:20 21:21 22:17 22:19,24 23:8	grouped 10:22 40:8
feel 47:3 65:14	folks 20:22 54:1	FY11 8:8	24:12,15,16 25:17 26:15 27:8 31:15	grouping 10:22
feeling 47:14	follow 7:8 67:19	<hr/> G <hr/>	32:24 34:14 36:10 38:22 41:10 42:19	guess 7:7,12 11:4 18:25 20:12 44:10
feels 24:6	follow-on 31:2	gallons 47:22 48:25 49:4,6	43:10,10,12,12 44:20 45:11,13	45:6,9 46:9 50:1
feet 19:19,20 45:11 49:9	foregoing 68:5,6,10	gaps 16:4,21	46:23,25 47:2,2 48:14 50:8,13	<hr/> H <hr/>
field 23:25 47:8 53:17,21,25 54:3	forest 50:6,7,24 51:2	gas 59:24 60:6		habitat 50:18
	forget 6:25	Gate 1:12 3:2		half 52:2
	form 55:1	Gee 2:10 5:17 26:17 27:15		hand 68:14
	formation 34:9	general 31:13		
	forth 34:10 39:10			
	forthcoming 13:10			

handle 22:2 24:6 26:15,19 handling 35:5 happen 28:9 47:1 happened 25:8 49:11,21 happening 18:23 57:21 happens 23:5 27:21 happy 18:14,17 hard 21:15 27:13 hauling 27:14 head 32:5 heading 21:7 health 29:22 59:15 hear 7:9 17:6 20:22 55:9 64:11 65:16 heard 67:8 hearing 55:7 65:17 heat 18:22 19:2 20:7,15 heated 18:24 help 36:7 55:10 helpful 62:15 helping 65:10 helps 37:12 hereunto 68:13 hesitant 46:22 high 26:12 37:23 47:20,23 49:7,10 49:10 64:5,5 higher 22:10 26:21 40:21 highly 63:7 historic 52:22 historical 24:9 32:8 historically 32:6 49:19 hit 27:21 hold 11:4 hope 6:9 16:15 44:15 46:2,3 51:21 hopefully 57:8 67:8 hoping 16:1 17:22	18:7 23:17,19,22 24:7 61:17 horrible 57:6 hot 61:8 houses 13:25 housing 13:25 huge 20:15 26:9 47:22 54:8 63:11 human 29:22 hundred 56:14 hundreds 48:25 Hunt 7:4 hydraulic 48:20 hydraulics 47:19 47:25 48:3 hydrocarbon 20:6 <hr/> I idea 30:10 42:24 46:23 47:7,16 52:16 57:17 61:23 62:1 ideas 55:8 62:13 identified 9:24 31:12,12 identify 12:3 17:4 imagining 45:8 51:2 immediately 33:16 impact 30:18 35:14 55:12 implement 17:18 17:20 37:11 implementation 16:14 18:8 important 33:11 42:18 51:11 impossible 54:21 improvements 20:10 incinerator 26:3 included 10:2 35:23 44:2 includes 11:19 14:21 including 31:14	inconsistency 34:16 incorporated 41:18 incorporating 37:1 40:3 increase 11:10 25:9 48:5 increased 11:8 25:5 incredible 48:4 incredibly 62:15 incurred 11:7 indicated 26:4 individual 9:19 individuals 65:10 influence 30:20 inform 37:19 38:17 38:19 information 8:7 32:8 38:14 46:5 49:21 61:3 informational 37:16 informs 38:6 initial 64:17 initiate 23:18 24:7 input-type 62:11 inside 22:25 Insurance 2:13 5:22 intensive 22:14 interaction 63:9 interest 11:14 12:4 12:4,6 43:24 interested 20:18 62:21 63:7 68:11 interesting 36:24 interim 35:6 interior 17:24 internal 15:8 22:24 52:9 63:24 internally 17:3 52:4 intimate 63:7 introduction 5:11 Introductions 4:3	investigation 39:22 64:18 investigations 38:16 39:20 49:20 invited 65:25 involved 19:22 36:17 41:5 43:3 58:19 62:21 67:2 issue 16:16 17:7 23:17 32:19 40:24 48:12 57:12 58:6 58:25 issued 23:21 35:8 59:6 62:6 issues 22:7 57:17 57:24 58:3,9,14 60:11 issuing 8:24 items 4:15,15 17:14 67:19,20 it'll 22:14 i.e 20:1 <hr/> J Jan 2:6 6:7 8:1,8 11:11 January 62:20,20 Jeff 2:15 5:23 22:18 job 29:20 John 2:13,18 5:21 6:1 7:3 30:2 32:6 34:3 Julie 2:12 21:15 June 18:10 <hr/> K keep 17:22 20:21 38:20 66:20 kept 47:24 Kern 2:3 4:3 5:1,11 5:20 6:8,17 7:13 7:18,24 11:4 18:19 19:10 20:12 29:25 43:15 45:1 46:9 49:23 50:25	51:15 52:14 53:15 55:14,18 56:12,22 57:5,13 59:2,19 61:4,12,15 62:1,8 63:3 64:8 65:1,5 65:18 66:9,21 67:7,13,17 key 63:1 kicked 16:20 56:6 kicks 23:6 kind 10:4 14:18 20:4 22:22 36:23 40:8 41:7 42:11 42:11 43:21,22 45:8 46:24 47:5 47:13 49:25 50:2 50:4,6 53:12,13 54:2,6,16 55:10 56:23 57:21,23 63:19 65:12 kinds 18:21 20:17 know 8:8 10:3 18:17,23 19:23 20:10,20 22:6,7 22:18 27:8,18,19 32:3,9,14,21 33:4 33:15,21 38:3,20 39:7,8 41:9 45:20 46:23 47:1,3,3,4,5 51:4,5,6,9 53:22 54:17,19,21 55:25 56:9,9,13,17,18 56:25 61:8 62:16 63:7,15 65:15 67:1,7 known 11:20 56:7 56:8 Krammer 2:5 6:3,3 51:24 <hr/> L labor 11:17 lagging 16:24 lake 6:20 16:25 17:2 61:16 62:23 62:25 63:6,11
--	---	---	--	---

64:4 landfill 6:2,13 7:2 7:15,19 8:13,18 13:5,19 14:9 15:11 16:1 23:18 28:2 30:1,6,16,17 30:20,24 31:10 32:18 33:3,3,4,7 33:13,17,17 38:2 39:17 41:15 42:14 43:4 45:3,21 46:11,17 47:20,22 48:4,8,23,25 49:10,17,18,19,25 50:6,16,24 51:1,6 53:16 54:1 55:19 57:19 61:6 64:13 66:24 landfills 32:7,12,14 32:14 lapse 28:8 laptop 30:3 large 48:6 67:19 larger 24:24 25:4 25:23 26:4 largest 12:10,11 Lasky 2:19 6:6,6 late 24:23 law 37:12 layer 38:12 lead 15:14 lead-based 9:15 12:25 13:24 20:23 21:10,13 24:11 leave 23:4 lechay 32:15,16 lesser 40:23 let's 46:22 57:13 level 58:15 59:22 60:13 levels 59:11 60:3 LFE 39:7 Liang 25:1 License 1:21 Liggett 21:5	line 14:1 36:10 50:2 list 9:4 10:1,2,5,7 56:17,22 64:6 listen 65:14 listening 65:8 literally 47:24 little 7:20 8:4 13:2 13:17 16:3,24 17:25 22:10 31:16 32:2 35:4 36:14 37:7 38:23 47:4 47:16 49:23 54:5 55:21 63:16 live 47:11 lived 63:6 located 39:7 long 20:9 56:18 longer 43:4 55:22 long-term 40:8 look 14:8,8 18:6 23:12,23 29:11 31:15,22 32:6,16 33:14 34:3 35:12 37:5 38:22 40:10 41:2 44:14 46:1 46:16 47:2,3 54:17 55:25 60:25 62:4 looked 25:2 31:23 32:1,11,13 33:21 33:22 35:3 41:3 50:5 54:2 62:6 looking 13:2 14:18 15:21 16:20 24:10 29:6,7 32:2,25 33:2,5,6 34:2 36:18 41:7 45:7 52:1,3,4 55:1 60:7 60:12,25 61:2,7,8 looks 5:1 20:25 Loop 21:5 lot 5:6,9 13:24 15:19 18:9 26:13 27:14 31:22 33:13 46:15 49:20 51:10	57:8 63:21 lots 49:8 low 43:24 lower 54:4 <hr/> M <hr/> MACTEC 24:25 main 8:20 13:3 22:12 25:14 maintenance 8:14 Majhail 2:17 6:5,5 61:10,13 62:19 63:23 65:21 66:16 67:1,12 major 40:1 44:5 majority 13:16 22:12 48:22 making 8:24 13:13 management 43:20 manager 2:19 5:25 7:4 25:2 43:1 manufacturer 59:24 60:6 map 50:2 March 1:11 3:2 5:4 marches 5:5 Mark 2:8 4:6 5:13 massive 46:17 matched 34:19 material 24:21 25:4 25:6 28:22 38:14 38:15 39:10,24 42:6 45:4,12 46:12 53:19,20 54:5,9 64:17 materials 38:3,3 39:17 44:3 math 24:16 matrix 19:8 35:10 35:22 matter 68:7 maximum 39:8 60:19 mean 14:9 25:22 29:7 30:18 32:9 37:19 43:5 46:14	47:9 54:20 67:8 meaningful 17:4,13 32:10 mechanic 18:13 mechanical 62:6 mediation 5:24 Medy 61:11 meet 53:16 meeting 1:1 3:2,5 5:4,8 6:15 18:16 30:7,9,12 52:15 61:5 62:20 63:1 64:2 65:13,19,25 65:25 66:2,5,7,10 66:11,14,14,19,22 66:23 67:2,3,3,4,5 67:22,24 68:5,10 meetings 66:5,12 67:9 meets 21:22 member 5:11,15,17 6:3,7 members 2:2 5:5 7:7,7 membrane 40:24 mentioned 20:13 24:11 26:17 55:22 57:15 Merchant 16:11 57:15 59:3,7 60:22 methodology 35:6 35:18 mid-month 63:1 milestones 8:4 million 11:8,19 13:18 14:10,13 24:18 25:15 26:11 28:15 29:8 mind 6:20 21:2 45:2 66:20 minds 53:24 minor 44:8 minute 47:22 48:25 49:4,6	minutes 60:18 miscellaneous 57:3 57:3 mode 17:10 model 38:5 48:10 modifying 36:2 37:20 moisture 19:2 moment 5:10 46:25 momentarily 16:15 Monday 46:20 money 29:4 54:20 monitor 31:5,11 54:10 monitored 33:25 monitoring 31:3,4 31:7,9,18 32:17 32:25 34:12,14,17 34:17,18,21 40:6 41:3 44:9,21,25 month 6:25 7:10 16:2,12 52:2 62:17 64:2 moot 41:6 morning 46:20 Morton 20:25 21:1 Mountain 6:20 16:25 61:16 62:23 62:25 63:6 64:4 move 8:1 16:17 23:14 24:10 52:10 moving 16:10 17:14 21:7 32:25 45:5,19 51:22 multiple 9:16 multiplier 43:19,21 municipal 32:14 Myers 2:16 6:4,4 65:4,8 <hr/> N <hr/> name 65:2,2 named 68:10,11 National 5:16 native 38:3 natural 50:18,21
---	---	--	---	---

52:21 53:20 54:12 54:15 nature 19:13 57:24 near 17:7 20:14 22:22 necessarily 20:2 22:6 30:18 33:25 41:16 66:24 necessary 28:22 29:21 necessitate 53:13 need 16:5 21:19 23:1,3 28:21 30:2 30:3,15 34:11 44:24 45:18,18 56:21 65:21 67:9 needs 22:4 49:16 52:21 neighborhood 63:19 64:4 neighborhoods 20:24 21:5 nervous 29:16,19 never 47:23 57:20 new 4:13 5:9 22:17 22:19 37:2 44:22 55:25 65:9 67:17 Nina 21:6 nine 37:9,11,19,19 37:21 nonexistent 9:6 nonresidential 21:1 21:6 22:13 normal 58:2 north 13:17 54:3 64:23 northeast 64:21 northern 42:11 noted 31:25 notice 3:1 56:1 57:9 noticed 55:25 61:5 65:6 number 18:19 32:19 39:19 56:13 67:18,19	numbers 25:18 26:12,17 41:20 58:13 <hr/> O objection 67:22 objective 53:17 objectives 50:11,21 52:5,7,20 obviously 18:23 23:17 45:21 47:4 47:17 occasionally 66:10 occurred 27:5 28:9 52:24 57:5 occurs 27:4 62:9 October 18:9 Officer 2:15 offset 11:17 offsets 11:14,15 12:3,7 oh 12:9 57:14 oil 28:1,4,4 Okay 7:24 12:22 51:16 59:2 63:3 66:16 old 4:5 6:22 once 13:10 14:16 15:9 65:24 ones 10:10 one-page 35:11 ONM 40:7,8,11,19 40:21 54:10 open 55:7 66:13 Operating 2:15 opportunity 13:11 13:22 19:12 opposed 60:18 optimistic 23:21 optimize 36:7 options 40:14 order 27:25 42:13 42:20 56:14 63:18 organizations 62:24,25 original 9:4 11:12	25:21 26:11 56:17 56:22 ought 55:9 outcome 68:11 outreach 62:18,24 63:2 64:5 outreaching 63:25 outside 57:10 overestimated 25:11 overly 23:21 oversimplified 38:22 overview 19:8 38:5 ooo 2:20 3:7 67:25 <hr/> P PAH 24:22 paint 9:15 12:25 13:24 20:23 21:10 21:13 22:5 24:11 parallel 51:23 parameters 31:4,13 31:18 park 5:6,16 8:17,23 13:11 15:10,15,18 15:20,25 16:9 23:22 57:16 58:6 58:19 59:1 60:1 61:2 parking 46:15 part 15:13 31:2 33:19 34:5 37:17 37:24 43:11 44:21 44:24 48:12 51:4 58:5,25 59:2 66:24 partially 52:16 participation 66:3 67:6 particular 19:23,25 26:6 28:19 33:10 38:2,9 particularly 27:13 parties 68:9 parts 65:12	paving 28:2 PDF 18:5 people 32:11,13 49:8 53:22 54:6 54:17 55:10 62:13 63:14 66:11 people's 53:24 percent 22:9 percentage 14:25 27:20 period 47:23 48:5 52:2 65:24 66:1,6 66:17 periods 47:20,24 Perry 2:16 6:4 49:17 65:3,5 person 2:14 5:19 43:3 60:19 personnel 7:5 pertain 52:8 petroleum 9:2 12:25 20:5 24:2 PG&E 59:23 60:4 pH 31:1 33:24 59:22 phonetic 5:21 32:15 pHs 59:11,15 60:3 physical 64:18 physically 49:2 pick 9:16 37:12 picture 45:24 pieces 32:23 pile 24:21 piling 46:13 pipe 48:9,17,21,24 49:13,14 place 48:18 68:6 placement 44:4,18 placing 37:23 plan 16:23 17:16 17:21 18:4 21:20 23:25 30:6 31:9 41:5 46:5 planned 15:19 31:7	planning 6:15,24 7:9 17:9 52:8 53:10 61:24 63:2 64:2 plans 14:15 17:21 22:20 25:19 39:16 41:7 45:7 48:17 plant 50:17 59:24 60:6 players 63:1 point 22:21 23:6 24:7 39:14 44:17 52:13 57:4 60:22 policies 29:6 policy 11:20 29:12 57:10 portion 17:18 42:7 position 16:13 44:20 53:20 54:15 positioned 52:10 possibilities 62:14 63:13 possibility 61:7 66:13 possible 49:2 63:10 post 31:3 potential 19:13 56:20 57:8 64:13 potentially 32:21 36:2 38:12 39:1 58:15 power 18:12 preferably 17:23 preference 38:20 preferred 45:10 preliminary 8:18 13:22 17:5 23:20 30:5,25 44:7 46:6 premature 46:7 preparation 15:24 31:17 prepare 8:18 35:11 51:21 prepared 18:4 40:2 43:5 60:9
---	--	---	---	---

<p>preparing 16:22 21:3</p> <p>presence 9:9</p> <p>present 7:5 35:9 39:3,6 41:7 51:22 52:19</p> <p>presentation 18:15 19:18</p> <p>Presentations 4:7</p> <p>presented 30:9 31:8 35:6 36:1 45:24</p> <p>Presidio 1:1,12 2:15 3:3,6 5:2 24:5 47:11</p> <p>Presidio-specific 58:18</p> <p>pressure 48:20</p> <p>presumably 7:15 29:5,6</p> <p>pretty 21:7 26:12 27:11 33:18 41:2 42:21 56:8 67:12</p> <p>previous 12:2 24:18 38:10,15</p> <p>previously 42:15</p> <p>price 28:4</p> <p>prices 27:19 28:1</p> <p>primarily 11:16 12:16 24:19</p> <p>primary 8:25 24:1 25:4 37:25 50:20</p> <p>principally 38:11</p> <p>prior 8:24 21:20 38:8 42:19,24</p> <p>priority 9:5,13 16:24 24:3 37:23 64:5,6</p> <p>proactive 65:15</p> <p>probability 57:6</p> <p>probably 10:2 17:6 20:5 22:9 23:21 33:15 37:7 38:23 41:2 45:17 55:9 59:6 61:14 66:6</p>	<p>Probations 63:17</p> <p>problem 22:2</p> <p>problems 18:22 42:22</p> <p>procedure 23:9 43:11</p> <p>PROCEEDINGS 1:11</p> <p>process 10:6 15:4 24:8,13 26:14 34:20 43:6,8 46:11 58:2,24</p> <p>processed 10:10</p> <p>processing 34:16</p> <p>produce 32:15</p> <p>program 9:2,25 11:13,18 12:25 18:8 21:11,13 22:14 31:3,4,8,18 32:17 34:13,18,22 44:22,25</p> <p>programs 13:3 21:12 34:14 44:9</p> <p>progress 8:25 13:14</p> <p>project 2:19 7:4 14:20 25:1,1,16 43:1 65:9</p> <p>projection 25:18</p> <p>projects 11:23 12:10 13:4 27:13</p> <p>promised 6:14</p> <p>promote 45:22</p> <p>proper 44:20</p> <p>properly 20:11</p> <p>properties 38:14 39:24 64:17</p> <p>proposal 58:10 59:21</p> <p>proposed 16:7 23:25 28:18 35:21 53:6 60:17,21</p> <p>protected 29:22</p> <p>provide 46:14</p> <p>provided 10:1,11</p>	<p>18:6 19:9 30:5 44:6</p> <p>provides 50:18</p> <p>providing 38:4</p> <p>provisions 3:6</p> <p>public 2:14 4:14 5:19 37:21 43:3 44:15 58:25 62:11 62:24 63:17 64:3 64:5 65:24,25 66:1,2,6,7,10,17 66:18,23 67:4,18</p> <p>purge 48:12</p> <p>purposes 36:1,3</p> <p>pursuant 3:1</p> <p>pursuing 46:10</p> <p>put 6:10 10:5 24:6 26:13,18 44:22 50:8,14,14 51:6</p> <p>puts 66:7</p> <p>putting 53:17</p> <p>P.E 2:16</p> <p>P.G 2:18</p> <p>p.m 67:24</p>	<p>31:2 34:8,12,25 38:25 42:19 47:18 60:14 61:4,10,13 64:12</p> <p>questions 6:20 7:19 7:23 8:9 18:20 19:10 24:14 29:24 30:9,13 40:1 45:2 46:7 55:19,24 64:9 65:7,16,20</p> <p>question-and-ans... 7:1</p> <p>quick 5:10 21:7 65:21</p> <p>quickly 52:11</p> <p>quiet 65:14</p> <p>quite 6:10 10:14 15:3 48:4 56:18</p>	<p>25:9 26:5,20 27:8 27:21 28:19 34:5 36:3 37:16 38:10 38:19 41:12 44:19 46:16,24 47:1,6 47:14 50:7 51:10 51:19 52:23 53:22 55:3 56:9,20</p> <p>reason 27:6 43:17 46:9 57:18</p> <p>reasonable 28:6,21 29:21 60:19</p> <p>reasons 11:9</p> <p>recap 30:4</p> <p>received 6:16 7:25 8:19 9:18 11:10 11:14,15 12:5,8,9 65:22</p> <p>recollection 56:12 56:23</p> <p>record 66:24 68:7</p> <p>records 27:1</p> <p>recovery 12:12,13</p> <p>recreational 52:21 60:15,17,20</p> <p>redesign 42:20</p> <p>reduce 42:17</p> <p>reduced 15:5</p> <p>reduction 46:14</p> <p>reel 11:21</p> <p>reestablish 50:11</p> <p>referral 41:24</p> <p>reflect 13:20 39:11</p> <p>refresh 44:11</p> <p>regard 34:20 38:21</p> <p>regarding 31:2</p> <p>regards 38:9</p> <p>Regional 4:11</p> <p>registered 49:11</p> <p>regrading 45:18,19</p> <p>regular 27:3 37:6</p> <p>regulation 37:10</p> <p>regulations 37:8</p> <p>regulator 43:4</p> <p>regulators 5:6,7</p>
---	---	---	---	--

regulatory 4:9 37:22,22 regulatory-driven 37:15 reimbursement 28:17,20 reimportation 43:17 rejected 54:25 related 34:12 38:11 44:2,8 releases 48:25 relieve 48:20 relocated 18:12 rely 24:16 remaining 11:18 22:12 24:3 remedial 15:7 17:15 23:18 25:2 remediation 9:25 13:6 17:2 23:7,8 35:7,10,19 37:10 37:24 41:8 55:3 56:10 57:6 62:21 remedied 48:12 remedies 35:22 remedy 28:19,23 29:22 35:1,14,15 35:25 36:4,6,11 38:6,18,19,20 42:5 45:10,17 53:1,8,14 remember 15:13 24:20 26:2 REMEMBERED 3:1 remittances 11:25 removal 8:12 25:3 26:22 41:14,16,23 42:6 remove 23:2 53:19 removed 19:7 25:7 54:4 removing 42:7 47:6 rep 46:6	repair 23:4 40:14 40:22,24 repairs 54:11 replace 22:20 report 4:6,8 6:12 6:23 8:8 9:19 13:10 15:7 16:8 31:24 55:22,23 56:20 59:5,7,9 60:10 61:23 reported 1:20 16:12 39:21 62:16 62:17 REPORTER'S 1:11 reports 8:3 30:22 representatives 7:3 republic 37:23 request 9:3 15:8 requested 37:1 requests 9:16 28:1 require 23:9 56:10 57:8 required 43:10 requirement 40:14 requirements 21:23 37:17 research 9:7 13:9 56:17 reserve 12:17 reservoir 49:15 residential 9:17 22:12 resources 52:22,22 respect 45:3 58:9 respond 6:15 7:21 8:1 30:8,10 61:14 response 32:24 39:3 responses 7:8 responsibility 9:25 16:16 25:24 restoration 1:1 5:3 5:12 53:2 restraints 50:22	resurrecting 17:15 17:20 retaining 31:12 retention 28:25 29:1,11,14 reuse 53:3,5,7 review 9:6 13:12,13 13:23 15:9,12,24 16:8 18:7 30:25 44:15 51:23 reviewed 8:16,23 16:9 30:21 33:9 44:11 56:19 reviewing 61:2 65:23 revise 38:23 revised 14:7 36:8 41:20 44:14 revision 44:2 revisions 44:8 RI 8:15 24:22 58:4 right 6:14 10:16,18 10:23 11:3 14:11 20:17 25:13 32:21 36:13 42:2,9 43:14 46:7 55:10 55:14,17 64:22 65:2 risk 51:22 58:10 59:15 60:16 RI/FS 8:15 15:23 23:20 Road 16:11 57:15 59:3,7 60:22 rods 18:21 role 38:9 55:3 roles 53:2 roof 22:17,19,21 23:10,10,12 27:21 roofing 24:21 room 47:7 round 15:9 RSL 11:20 29:12 run 19:6 48:6 runoff 45:22	runs 47:23 Ryan 18:14,16 <hr/> S <hr/> safety 38:25 Sam 2:11 5:15 7:24 9:20 36:14 42:5 sample 21:25 30:22 39:24 sampled 22:7 25:23 samples 64:19 sampling 19:7 23:25 61:6 San 1:12 3:3 5:3 68:2 Sanches 20:25 SARAH 1:20 3:4 68:20 saved 14:10 savings 14:18 saw 44:7 50:1 saying 43:9 52:17 61:17 says 12:7 scenario 63:12 scenarios 61:1 schedule 8:5 15:6 17:3,4,11 22:11 24:13 44:10 53:12 55:12 56:2,3 61:22 66:11 67:9 scheduled 62:25 scheduling 66:14 scientific 63:21 scope 16:7 score 35:16,20 scoring 35:18 screen 56:19 screening 34:9,9 se 37:25 season 13:16 14:15 17:25 49:7 second 8:19 14:15 section 43:21 65:10 sections 8:15 sediments 17:2	see 15:21 18:9 27:12 42:11 49:1 55:16 57:13,23 seeing 43:24 seen 49:8 seep 47:21 49:6 seismic 38:25 39:2 39:5,8,17,25 40:25 48:1 64:13 64:20 selection 35:1,25 36:4,11 37:25 38:6,19 selective 36:5 self-insured 28:24 29:1,11,14 send 18:5 55:24 sense 10:13 14:18 21:12 28:20,24 36:21 49:12 sent 8:9 67:15 separate 66:23 separately 12:7 19:6 series 18:25 service 5:6 8:17,24 13:11 15:11,16,20 15:25 16:9 23:22 57:16 58:6,19 59:1 61:2 services 5:16 65:10 service's 60:2 session 7:1,6 sessions 46:5 set 28:5 37:12 62:19 68:13 setting 52:6 share 17:3,11 46:5 51:18 58:5 sharing 15:10 sheriff 15:18 short 29:8 48:5 52:2 show 39:17 56:8 61:22 67:3
--	---	---	--	--

<p>showed 49:1 50:2 shows 12:23 56:3 Sibley 20:25 side 49:24 50:12 51:13,14,15 signature 30:15,17 30:18,19 31:3,5 31:17 32:8,16,20 33:24 signatures 34:10 significant 42:22 62:11 similar 19:23 26:2 42:14 Simonds 21:5 simple 19:8 40:22 simply 25:12 33:8 44:3 sink 20:15 site 8:12 13:15 14:14 15:3,8 16:3 16:6,12,13,19,22 23:15 24:1 25:5,8 26:4 27:10 28:19 28:21 38:5,6 41:17 42:12 46:17 50:5 52:9 53:13 53:16 57:7,14 58:6,16 59:17,22 60:18,20,23 61:6 62:9 63:8 sites 6:19 9:12,19 11:20,21 12:13,14 21:2 26:6 29:22 33:14 38:1,2 55:21 56:4,5,5,7,7 56:10,21 57:3,24 59:24 60:6,8 67:19 site-specific 8:5 58:12,18 61:1 sitting 47:14 55:10 situ 18:4 24:9 situation 42:14 size 39:11,13</p>	<p>slab 23:2,4 slide 12:2 slightly 41:8 54:3 slope 32:7 42:11,13 42:16,17,21,21,22 43:9 45:5 64:13 64:21 smaller 24:20,21 soil 12:25 19:7 23:2 31:12 32:10 40:23 45:10,11 47:4 solids 31:1 solvent 19:4 somebody 17:12 somewhat 27:2 soon 44:16 46:3 51:19 sorry 12:1 47:12 sort 14:24 16:14 29:3 32:23 34:4 34:11 38:4 45:25 48:10 63:20 sorts 39:18 source 38:13 48:11 48:22,24 South 21:5 speak 32:18 45:16 special 18:25 specific 8:9 58:3 specifically 60:6 specifics 45:16 specs 17:21 speechless 7:20 spend 46:4 60:18 60:19 spending 21:21 spent 13:24 spot 25:14 61:8 stability 64:20 stabilization 43:10 stabilize 41:17 45:13 stabilizing 22:5 stable 42:12,13,21 staff 11:17</p>	<p>standard 27:1 standards 52:6 standpoint 37:4 52:4 start 23:23 24:8 51:25 52:3 65:24 66:17 started 52:3 starts 20:1 State 3:5 68:1 stated 68:6 status 4:9 8:5 20:10 57:2 stay 65:13 steam 9:16 19:3 steep 42:11,21 45:14 46:15 stood 31:1 story 36:24 straight 50:2 stream 47:24 49:9 50:21 street 20:25 51:20 strength 39:10,17 stress 39:17 stressors 35:13,15 35:17 strings 38:15 structure 23:9 48:9 studies 7:2 13:20 19:22 study 20:3 60:1 stuff 41:2 submit 9:2 24:2 53:9 submitted 9:5,11 9:13,16 24:4 44:13 submitting 13:12 15:12 Substances 4:10 substantiated 10:15 subtracting 45:4 successful 19:16</p>	<p>suddenly 49:3 suggesting 37:14 suggestion 63:15 64:7 66:20 suggestions 40:4 sulfate 31:1 summarizing 13:9 summary 11:6 31:23 37:18 38:5 summer 13:21 15:17 17:23 summer/early 24:23 supporting 27:2 47:15 sure 7:21 12:23 19:14 20:19 21:22 29:18 32:25 34:4 45:6 49:8 52:6 57:13 65:1 surface 32:20 45:14 surprise 13:15 surprised 45:23 surprisingly 13:5 surrounding 30:17 suspect 25:16 swail 50:14 system 19:6 20:20 25:13 50:21 51:8 54:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>table 35:10,11,23 take 5:10 18:6 23:23 31:4 61:13 taken 20:6 31:10 68:5 talk 8:5 talked 18:3,13 49:17,23 talking 12:7 16:3 19:25 33:23 40:9 49:5,6 53:15,17 54:8 58:17,22,24 63:23 tank 9:12,21 10:1,3</p>	<p>10:5 12:14 tanks 9:3,4,6,11,23 10:7,19,23 11:2 24:3,5 targeting 15:16 technical 20:22 63:10 65:11 technology 18:15 20:9 tell 57:25 temperature 19:3 tenant 17:17,18 tend 26:24 tends 20:1 tent 20:4 terminology 63:19 terms 12:24 15:6 27:3 35:19 44:10 58:5 testing 39:23 64:13 64:18,19 tests 34:17,20 text 39:11 41:1 thank 7:12 12:22 22:16 55:18 64:8 64:24 65:19 thanks 6:8 7:24 64:6,8 67:23 thermal 18:4 thing 50:1,3 54:16 61:16 62:11 65:24 66:22 things 6:11 19:13 20:4,18 26:22 27:7,22,23 30:25 32:15 39:18 44:4 44:9 45:8,22 46:19 49:21 52:14 58:13,22,23 62:3 62:8 65:11,14 67:11 think 6:18 10:2 16:12 17:16 18:20 19:10 22:8,9 24:4 28:7 32:23 37:5</p>
---	---	---	---	---

39:3 40:11,18 41:25 44:23 45:1 45:17 46:18 48:7 50:3 52:9 53:2,24 54:21 55:6,15 56:22 57:15 58:1 58:2,4 59:5,6,9,25 60:13 61:5,10 62:11 63:11 64:15 67:18 thinking 19:17 33:10 41:6 46:15 50:23 62:3,14 thought 24:21 26:4 50:9 thoughts 55:8 64:10 three 7:5 40:6,7,12 47:10 57:20 three-quarters 21:16 threshold 35:25 throw 62:12 66:12 time 5:2,5 8:14 9:24 11:17 13:25 18:3,10 21:21,23 28:8 40:19 46:18 47:23 48:5 55:21 66:3 67:5,6 68:6 timely 6:19 timetable 39:5 today 5:19 44:14 65:8,22 tomorrow 55:16 Toni 2:5 6:3 tonight 5:7 6:9 7:16 40:2 67:11,23 top 15:21 32:5 45:11 46:13 53:18 53:25 topics 7:11 total 25:15 43:19 43:24 52:18 53:21 tow 45:12,13 Toxic 4:10	TPH 19:4 tracking 67:20 TRANSCRIPT 1:11 treatability 19:22 20:3 treated 19:5 treatment 18:5 24:9 trench 49:25 trouble 65:17 truck 27:14 trucking 44:3 true 68:7 Trust 3:6 4:8 5:6,8 5:23,25 6:2 9:18 9:24 11:16 16:13 17:19 22:4 25:1 26:7 29:7,10,11 30:4 52:4,19 53:9 55:5 58:20 60:1 60:21 63:18,20 Trust's 29:18 truth 60:11 try 9:8 16:18 38:20 trying 15:17 17:2 17:21 22:11 29:20 29:21 34:1 38:4 52:5 53:1 55:4 59:4 62:19 65:13 Tsui 4:10 Tuesday 1:11 6:25 7:10 turn 28:13 turnout 7:6 twice 21:1 two 7:3 31:2 39:21 52:2,15,25 57:7 67:9 type 13:1 37:1 56:21 types 18:25 typically 43:20	5:16 58:8,21 59:9 59:16,21 60:5,16 60:23 ultimately 54:25 58:15 uncertainty 27:16 28:10 underestimated 25:11 underneath 23:4 undersigned 68:4 understand 34:1 64:4 understanding 59:14 Unfortunately 26:1 unilateral 36:12 units 9:18 universe 56:13 unknown 11:21 12:13 16:12 56:5 56:5,7 unsubstantiated 9:4,11,21 10:8,19 10:21,24 unusual 63:16 update 27:4,5 updated 27:2 Updates/Inputs 4:9 upgraded 33:18 upgrading 30:17 30:25 31:21 32:4 33:3,4,5,13,16 34:5 44:19 uphill 50:6 Upper 21:4 urban 59:16,19,24 60:6 URS 16:25 use 14:25 26:18 27:1 31:20 60:15 user 60:17 usual 5:1 usually 15:4 utilities 18:11	V valley 38:12 value 50:18 vapor 23:2 vapors 20:5 variety 12:10 vast 48:22 vendor 19:24 vendor's 19:18 venting 19:11 verify 61:15 versus 34:9 37:11 54:11 62:7 63:8 vicinity 33:15 Virginia 2:19 6:6 43:1 49:18 virtual 11:2 visible 62:9 visualization 47:9 visualize 46:25 47:6 51:4 visualizing 18:20 62:14 VMP 52:7 voice 65:17 void 49:16 volatilize 19:4 volatilized 20:7 volatilizing 20:1 volume 25:4,6,22 49:10 volumes 28:13 volunteers 63:6	58:11 warmed 62:13 wasn't 25:21 26:8 28:5 44:3 waste 8:12 26:22 32:22 45:19 54:12 water 4:11 20:21 32:20 48:12,22 49:3,9,13 50:15 watershed 33:19 way 20:9 24:15 26:18 34:22 35:4 35:20 41:8 47:14 53:9,11 55:9,15 63:19 68:10 ways 15:17 60:25 weeks 49:4,14 52:15,25 welcome 4:3 5:2,5 5:8,20 65:18 wells 19:1 32:3 33:2,7,13,14,18 33:21 34:1,5 44:18,22,24 well-developed 35:20 went 11:23,23 24:17 28:15 35:3 50:4 57:19,22 west 51:14,15 64:23 western 50:12 wet 20:20,21 we'll 6:13 7:9,10,18 13:12 15:10,12 16:22 18:10 26:14 27:12 32:25 33:6 34:7,20 39:8 40:3 55:18 63:25 64:1 67:5,10 we're 14:5,16 15:6 15:9,9,17,20,24 16:1,2,8,16 17:10 17:22 18:1,7 20:23 21:4,7,21
	U Ullensvang 2:9		W Wagner 16:19 walked 54:2 wall 24:9 want 12:3 29:25 32:18 51:7,18 54:6 63:4,8,16 65:23 66:15 wanted 30:8 61:15 65:5 wanting 33:21	

22:8 23:13,17,19 23:22 24:5,7,10 24:12 25:15,16 26:13,20 29:14,15 29:19,20 30:10 31:15 32:24 35:4 35:5 38:3,22 39:12 46:2 50:12 51:5,22 52:1,10 53:1,5,15,17 54:8 54:9,10,23 57:2 57:11 58:1,9 59:1 60:12 64:2 67:2 67:20 we've 8:13 9:10 13:11,13 18:6 19:7 21:15,25 30:21 34:19 35:20 35:22 36:1 38:16 39:9,10 51:3 56:6 62:4 63:24 64:17 WHEREOF 68:13 whittled 56:23 windy 50:4 wish 46:17 WITNESS 68:13 wonder 46:19 55:19 wonderful 47:8 wondering 21:9,11 26:19 43:23 45:9 50:7 52:18 wording 40:9 41:1 work 8:21,23 15:19 16:16,22 17:16,19 17:24 18:4 20:11 21:20 22:22 23:1 23:3 24:12,22 26:14 33:9 41:3 43:22 44:9 47:19 48:2 50:8 51:9 52:18 55:11 56:18 62:22 63:17 66:14 67:10 worked 14:25	working 13:25 15:6 15:9,14,15,18 16:4,8,18,23 17:1 18:14 20:23 24:25 28:24 39:12 57:2 57:16 58:1,3,9 59:1 65:11 works 11:12 15:2 67:10 workshops 64:3 worthwhile 36:20 wouldn't 19:20 23:10 66:6 written 24:17 wrong 25:10 Wyman 20:24 <hr/> X X 46:14 <hr/> Y yeah 32:13 37:18 40:10 43:5 55:6 59:13 65:14 year 8:7,12,19 17:8 17:9,23 22:13 61:18,21,24,24 years 17:17 51:9 54:22 57:18,20 yes/no 35:14 Youngkin 2:8 4:6 5:13,13 6:24 40:5 40:16 41:1 67:15 <hr/> Z Zurich 2:13 5:22 12:13 28:17,18 29:5,6,12 <hr/> \$ \$1.6 26:11 \$2 24:18 \$5 13:18 <hr/> 1 1 4:3 8:12 15:23	25:21 57:14 61:6 1A 8:16 23:20 24:19,20 57:14 60:23,24 1/Landfill 13:15 14:14 23:16 25:8 27:10 10 4:16 13:5 14:6,7 15:11 28:2 42:14 46:11,17 57:19 100 19:3,19 110 19:19 13 42:4 13446 1:21 3:4 68:20 135 1:12 3:3 14 42:4 14th 30:7 14.9 41:23 42:1 144 9:3 10:23 162 11:8 24:16 18 51:9 1999 9:24 <hr/> 2 2 4:4 8:13,22 13:8 13:15 14:9,14 16:4 23:16 24:1 25:8 27:10 57:15 61:6 2A 12:11 20 19:20 20th 62:20 200 56:24 2003 31:24,25 32:1 2009 35:7 2010 5:4 8:10 39:22 64:18 68:14 2011 1:11 3:2 5:4,4 2012 22:14,15 2013 61:25 2014 56:5 2015 56:2 207/231 16:23 18:3 22nd 30:8 228 24:9	25th 7:1 <hr/> 3 3 4:5 26:2 45:11 49:9 30 29:8 60:18 30th 8:10 34 11:19 <hr/> 4 4 4:6 15:6,14 <hr/> 5 5 4:7 5(B) 6:21 50 22:9 47:22 49:4 49:5 <hr/> 6 6 4:9 9:13 6B 16:19,19 669 26:3,8,10 <hr/> 7 7 4:13 7.9 39:8 <hr/> 8 8 1:11 3:2 4:14 9:5 24:3 57:19 8:59 67:24 800 56:23 <hr/> 9 9 4:15 15:11 937 17:15,17 22:17 22:19 99 28:15	
--	---	---	--	--

1
2
3
4 DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY &)
REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN (FS/RAP))
5 PRESIDIO - LANDFILL E)
_____)

6
7
8
9
10 PUBLIC MEETING

11
12
13
14
15 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

16 THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2011

17 GOLDEN GATE CLUB

18 PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

19
20
21
22
23
24 Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR

License No. 5527

25

1 PRESENTERS AND PANEL

2
3 RADHIKA MAJHAIL - Public Participation Specialist
Department of Toxic Substances Control

4
VIRGINIA LASKY - Project Manager
5 Department of Toxic Substances Control

6 PERRY MYERS - Project Engineer
Department of Toxic Substances Control

7
8 ---o0o---

9 SPEAKERS

	Page
11 MS. RADHIKA:	3
12 MS. LASKY:	9
13 MR. MYERS:	14

14
15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

16 MS. BLUM: 21

17
18 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
19 of the Meeting, and on April 7, 2011, 7:06 PM at the
20 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
21 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
22 California, there commenced a Public Meeting under the
23 auspices of the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

24 ---o0o---

1 MS. MAJHAIL: Good evening, everybody. My
2 is Radhika Majhail. I'm a Public Participation
3 Specialist for the Department of Toxic Substances Control
4 and I will be the moderator for tonight's meeting.

5 Before we get into the meeting details, let
6 me go over some housekeeping stuff. The restrooms are
7 out the door towards your left and the drinks are all on
8 the right.

9 There is a sign-in sheet on the back table
10 with some project documents, presentations that is up
11 here. I also have meeting evaluation sheets over there,
12 and I request you to fill them out and leave them before
13 exiting the meeting tonight. I also have comment cards
14 back there.

15 This is an official meeting and we have a
16 court reporter here. So during the comment section, the
17 comments will be recorded and whatever comments we will
18 have will also be recorded.

19 So for that purpose, I expect people,
20 whenever you raise some of your comments, please state
21 your first name and last name clearly and loudly so that
22 it's easy for him to capture your name and your comment.

23 But if you're hesitant and you don't want
24 to read out your comment or you don't want to speak right
25 now at the meeting, there are comment cards back there.

1 You can submit a written comment here today, as well.

2 The purpose for tonight's meeting is for
3 the Department of Toxic Substances Control to advise you
4 of the plan and the FS/RAP and to go over the CEQA
5 document, which is also up for public review, as well.

6 After a brief introduction from me, we will
7 have presentations by Virginia Lasky, the DTSC project
8 manager for Landfill E and Perry Myers, who is the
9 project engineer for Landfill E project, as well.

10 After the presentation, we will open the
11 floor for the comment period. Again, it's an official
12 comment period for everyone, and whatever questions or
13 comment you have will be recorded, will be official.

14 And if you have any questions during the
15 presentation, I request you to hold those questions till
16 the very end so when we're done with the presentation, we
17 can take them at that time.

18 Let's have a little bit about what is FS/
19 RAP. It's the same document that we are here for that is
20 out for public review. It's a decision document. It
21 tells about the -- what the remedy being proposed, the
22 alternatives that were proposed to us and which the
23 department is likely going to select one of those.

24 After -- after the public -- after the LFE
25 and after the comment period is over, we will take a look

1 at all the comments that we receive and generate a
2 response to comments document.

3 Anyone who submits a response to us will
4 receive the response to comments document in mail, and
5 that document will also be available online and on our
6 website as well as the trust website.

7 Again, the comment period is a thirty-day
8 comment period. It ends on April 22nd.

9 Let me go over with you a little bit about
10 the DTSC process, the cleanup process in general.

11 Site discovery is the first stage when the
12 department becomes aware of the site. If there's
13 contamination, we find out about the site.

14 After that step, we move on to the next
15 step called a preliminary endangerment assessment or BEA.
16 We usually use that term.

17 At this stage, the basic question is why do
18 we need to do clean up? Is a cleanup necessary? Do we
19 need to do cleanup?

20 So here, what we do is we look for the
21 comprehensive evaluation. We do some crisp screening and
22 we see if a clean up required.

23 If it is required, then we move on to this
24 tab, which is called a Remedial Investigation. This is
25 more in-depth, in detail investigation, and then this is

1 where we come up with how we should do the cleanup, is it
2 going to end up as a RAP or is it going to end up as a
3 RAW.

4 What's the difference between these two?
5 Any cleanup that is under two million, it becomes a RAW,
6 Removal Action Work plan. Over two million becomes a
7 Remedial Action Plan, a RAP.

8 During the -- while we're doing the
9 Remedial Investigation, and actually I'll -- let's start
10 over here.

11 While we are doing the PEA and we know
12 there is a project that we have to do cleanup, that's
13 where our public project branch does the community
14 profile and the public participation plan side by side
15 when we are doing -- when the project team is doing the
16 investigation.

17 Community profile and -- and the public
18 participation plan are basically done to assess the
19 community, to see whether the needs of the community, the
20 concerns, the issues and, you know, whatever help we can
21 just assess the community, but in general.

22 For Presidio, instead of the public
23 participation plan, community relations plan was
24 developed. That was for Presidio-wide. Not just for
25 Landfill E, but Presidio-wide.

1 Now, today we are here for a public
2 meeting, which is actually this phase right here. Once
3 the -- once the cleanup is proposed, once the document is
4 proposed, we hold -- in between the public comment
5 period, we hold a public meeting where we can write the
6 public, we can discuss, we can overview the document with
7 them.

8 Along with -- with the RAP, we also have a
9 public CEQA document. This is actually a document where
10 we are trying to see are there any effects, are there any
11 impacts of the cleanup on -- on the environment.

12 In this case, we found out that it's a
13 Negative Declaration or a Neg Dec, which means that there
14 are no impacts of the cleanup on the environment.

15 After the public meeting, what's going to
16 happen next -- after the public meeting, we are going to
17 have -- right here. We're going to continue with the
18 public comment period, continue receiving the public
19 comments, write a response to comments document, and
20 after -- and if we have to quantify the RAP based on the
21 comments received, that will be done then and the RAP --
22 the Draft RAP, FS/RAP will become final.

23 Once it's final, the CEQA's final, then we
24 move on to the remedial design phase right here where
25 actually we start on designing the project. What we talk

1 about in the remedy, we talk about on paper, we start
2 working on it and mention how we will be working on it.

3 After that phase, we move on to the
4 implementation phase. This is actually the physical
5 implementation of the work of the design document. It
6 will come to work.

7 That's when you see all the work and that's
8 when you see the trucks coming in, trucks going out,
9 digging, whatever they propose under that stage. Here is
10 when the implementation is started, about to start.

11 The Department of Toxic Substances control
12 will send out the work hours and the nature of work, the
13 type of work, what to expect from the work. So the work
14 notice will be mailed out to you before -- before the
15 work starts.

16 Once the work is done, the department
17 certifies the site. Also, we will also decide on if
18 there is any operation and maintenance that is supposed
19 to go on after the certification is done, after the work
20 is done, if we need to maintain to make it a clean
21 project.

22 All of this goes into that phase. This was
23 a very generic of our overview of the process. Not every
24 site goes through this process. There are some steps we
25 miss and it depends on the type of the site, as well.

1 Now let's talk about stakeholders. Every
2 project has stakeholders. For Presidio, we have
3 identified three basic stakeholders here. The first
4 being the regulatory agencies. That will be -- DTSC will
5 be one of them, and the Regional Water Quality Control
6 Board.

7 The second main stakeholder is the
8 landowners, which are the Presidio Trust and the National
9 Park Service.

10 For the public, that's the third major
11 stakeholder, and we have general public, plus we have the
12 Restoration Advisory Board or the RAB that works for the
13 Presidio, as well.

14 Now that you've got a brief idea how our
15 process works, I'm going to hand over the stage to
16 Virginia Lasky. She will talk in detail about the
17 various alternatives that were proposed and site
18 background.

19 MS. LASKY: And investigation.

20 MS. MAJHAIL: And the investigation and
21 background investigation which she'll talk about in a
22 second.

23 MS. LASKY: Good evening, everyone. I'm
24 sure you're familiar with this map. We're showing here
25 the Landfill E within the Presidio.

1 And here's a look over Landfill E within
2 the immediate surrounding, and -- okay. North of
3 Landfill E is the firing range, and about 500 feet of
4 that is Fernandez street, and south is -- is a wooded
5 area, and then the western portion is the drainage
6 section of the Tennessee Hollow -- Tennessee Hollow
7 watershed area, and the eastern portion is the housing or
8 residential area on Quarry Road.

9 Site history and use. Landfill E is a
10 former Army waste disposal site which was used
11 approximately from 1946 to 1973. It was created by
12 feeding a portion of the western drainage of the
13 Tennessee Hollow watershed and was formerly used as a
14 ball field and parking lot.

15 The landfill is about 4.6 acres in size and
16 contains about 107,500 cubic yards of fill material. The
17 characteristics of the landfill contain little or no
18 debris.

19 From three feet down, fifteen feet, debris
20 was observed. The debris found is wood, metal, brick,
21 ash, glass, concrete and household rubbish.

22 The maximum depth of the fill is 39 feet.
23 A broken pipe has been located in the middle of the
24 landfill to drain the upper part of the watershed which
25 runs south to north through the landfill.

1 The landfill lies above the native colma
2 formation, and groundwater is about seven to twenty feet
3 below the bottom of the landfill.

4 This is the contour of the landfill. As
5 shown, the length -- as shown, the length and the depth
6 is pretty extensive. The thickest fill material of about
7 39 feet thick is located almost on the northern portion
8 of the site, almost in the center of the landfill.

9 The material -- the fill material thins out
10 from the middle towards -- toward the edges of the
11 landfill. The depth of the filters varies because of the
12 original shape of the canyon.

13 Several soil investigations were conducted
14 by the Army from the 1990s to 2003.

15 In 2010, the trust conducted additional
16 soil investigation to further characterize the landfill.
17 A combination of 132 soil samples were collected and
18 analyzed for different chemicals such as metals,
19 pesticides, herbicides, polychlorinated biphenyls or
20 PCBs, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons or PAHs,
21 semi-volatile organic compounds or SVOCs, volatile
22 organic compounds or VOCs or total petroleum hydrocarbons
23 or TPHs.

24 Several groundwater monitoring wells and
25 piezometers were installed within the landfill, including

1 those in the upgradient and downgradient locations of the
2 landfill. Groundwater has been monitored on a regular
3 basis since 1995 analyzing for similar -- similar
4 chemicals mentioned earlier, including general minerals.

5 On the landfill side, about thirteen soil
6 gas probes have been installed within and around the
7 perimeter of Landfill E. The soil gases were analyzed
8 for volatile organic compounds and major gas
9 constituents, including methane.

10 Other field investigations include
11 geotechnical and trenching to characterize fill and
12 delineate the edges of the landfill.

13 Site risks. Content of the landfill may
14 potentially pose risk to humans and ecologic receptors.
15 The primary source of the waste fill material, COCs, are
16 metals. Pesticides and PAHs have been detected, but not
17 a large concentration. The underlying soils have not
18 been impacted.

19 A soil gas survey indicates vinyl chloride
20 was detected once in 2002 and once in 2010 above the
21 commercial screening level for soil gas. The use of the
22 screening number is conservative since it assumes that a
23 building will be built on top of the landfill.

24 Methane was detected up to thirteen percent
25 in one location within the interior of the waste mass,

1 but not detected at the perimeter of the landfill.

2 Landfill gas is present in waste mass. It
3 has passed its peak production potential and has been
4 declining over the last forty years and is expected to
5 continue to decline.

6 In groundwater, cadmium, nickel and fuel
7 oil have been detected slightly above drinking water
8 levels and sporadically. There was selected COCs,
9 although groundwater is not significantly affected by the
10 waste material.

11 The primary cleanup objectivity of the RAP
12 is the protection of the human health and the environment
13 and compliance with federal and state laws and
14 regulations.

15 The protection of the human health and
16 environment will be accomplished by preventing physical
17 contact with waste fill, managing potential for
18 controlled landfill gas migration and minimizing the
19 potential for water to seep into waste fill.

20 Cleanup level. Cleanup levels have been
21 developed for the entire Presidio for different
22 receptors, and therefore expanding uses, and are very
23 specific to the type of media and ecology.

24 The planned land use for Landfill E for
25 human health is residential and recreational. It

1 includes residential because of the nearby residents on
2 Quarry Road.

3 For ecological, Landfill E is located in an
4 area classified as a buffer zone. The particular area
5 contains colma and serpentinite, so that background
6 information will be used for cleanup levels.

7 Protection of groundwater for drinking
8 water and protection of surface water are also applicable
9 for the site. Presently groundwater at the site is not
10 used for drinking water.

11 Thank you, and our next speaker will be
12 Perry Myers, a DTSC engineer.

13 MR. PERRY: Good evening. Thanks for
14 coming.

15 This is draft representation of our
16 conceptual site model. It puts all of the pieces that
17 Virginia talked about earlier and merges them kind of
18 into one picture.

19 Sometimes it's a lot easier to figure
20 things out this way. Basically you've got rainwater
21 which falls on the surface of the landfill. Some of it
22 percolates a little bit.

23 We've got water drainage above that comes
24 down the drainage pipes she talked about. Here's the
25 area that we believe is broken from video surveys.

1 So the mechanism for a lot of the
2 infiltration of the water as it gets down into the pipe
3 and comes down into the perched water table down here.

4 That has the potential to percolate down to
5 groundwater. The native material down here. This is the
6 north area where it sloughs off.

7 It puts everything into a nice picture and
8 give you folks something to look at.

9 Remedial alternatives were considered in
10 the RAP. The trust put this together when they did an
11 evaluation in the Remedial Investigation phase.

12 They looked at the applicable technologies
13 for what was found and type of contamination, what we
14 have in the landfill. They used those to develop
15 alternatives.

16 The approach was using US Environmental
17 Protection Agency guidance document for landfills at
18 military sites that comes up with presumptive remedies.

19 The idea is to create some efficiencies and
20 cost savings and other things, and we came up with these
21 three different alternatives to review.

22 No action is something we always have in
23 there. We look at that to make sure we're not doing
24 cleanup for no reason at all. If there were no health
25 risk to people or to the ecology, we wouldn't do

1 anything.

2 We basically have two different
3 alternatives when you look at what will be done. You
4 have complete removal of the waste mass out there
5 followed up by some short-term monitoring is one
6 proposal. Cost of that is fourteen million dollars.

7 The other would be a containment remedy,
8 and that has three different variations. Basically
9 that's leaving the waste in place, regrading the waste
10 and putting in a soil cover over the top.

11 The differences between A, B and C, A is a
12 two foot layer of clean soil on top of the waste material
13 once it's regraded. B uses a one foot layer of clay to
14 get a little more impermeable layer on top of that to
15 protect the clay layers, and C would use a geosynthetic
16 clay liner, which is a little of vitrinite trapped
17 between two layers of plastic, another impermeable layer.

18 The three of them are very similar. They
19 get a little more complicated as you get down to B and C.
20 There's a little more cost to it. Cost goes from 3.5
21 million to 4.3 million on that estimate.

22 Basically 2 and 3 are the two alternatives
23 that were run through the total evaluation on a detailed
24 basis. We use nine criteria established in CERCLA to
25 look at these.

1 The start of that is the threshold
2 criteria. It has to be protective of the human health
3 and environment, has to meet all the ARARs which are
4 applicable for relevant and appropriate which are state
5 laws and other things that kick in.

6 So we ran through the entire analysis and
7 chose alternative 3A as the proposed alternative in this
8 RAP.

9 3A is basically going out, regrading the
10 waste material, taking all the biological material,
11 plants and all that stuff off the top.

12 They're going to pull some of the waste
13 material back from the southern end and also along the
14 western side and consolidate it in the center of the
15 landfill.

16 That top layer of that will then be
17 compacted to create a foundation layer. On top of that,
18 we would bring in a geonet, which is kind of a thicker
19 plastic surface that's more porous, and the idea of that
20 is it will help -- it's a venting system for any methane
21 or landfill gases that are created from the disturbance
22 we have that's still kind of percolating along in various
23 pockets inside the landfill right now.

24 That gets tied into vent stacks. That's a
25 passive system for now. If need be, it can be converted

1 over to an active system if testing and monitoring down
2 the road indicates that more methane will be created than
3 we believe will.

4 On top of the geonet, we'll come in with
5 two feet of clean soil. One of the advantages of clean
6 fill without the GCL or clean layer is it makes it easier
7 to plant plants. We don't have to worry about roots
8 penetrating through our impermeable layer. So it gives
9 the trust flexibility of what they want to do.

10 The top surface of it will be graded to
11 divert surface water off of the landfill so we don't have
12 surface water percolating like it was shown in the
13 central site metal back in that figure.

14 There will also be long-term monitoring of
15 groundwater, surface water and landfill gas and cover.
16 We need to make sure that our clean soil stays on top of
17 whatever ends up out there and also gets into land use
18 controls that would manage all that and operation and
19 maintenance.

20 Total cost for this is projected to be 3.5
21 million.

22 This is kind of a -- why we chose this. It
23 does meet all of our cleanup objectives. It is the least
24 expensive. It eliminates quite a few truck trips,
25 107,000 cubic yards of waste that will have to be hauled

1 out of here and it was classified as hazardous waste,
2 which means it will have to go to Kettleman City which is
3 several hours away.

4 That facility, however, is currently not
5 accepting new waste from clients right now. We can't
6 take it there. So we will have to haul it all the way
7 down to Buttonwillow or someplace further south.

8 So we start to look at impacts and
9 generation of greenhouse gases and impacts to the
10 community and other things, but this proposed cover
11 promotes human health, it controls landfill gases, and it
12 minimizes the water seepage in the landfill.

13 Without the clay layer and the GCL layer in
14 there, it is relatively easy to maintain, and it does
15 allow for future site uses such as a ball field, native
16 plant restoration and historic forest restoration, as
17 well.

18 Here's a conceptual diagram of what it
19 would look like. It's pretty flat up on top. Over here
20 on this side, there will be the drainage. Blue lines
21 basically reflect the way water will flow around it.

22 This reflect the downshoot area on this
23 side. You've got an open channel on this side that will
24 eventually go underground.

25 Things get a bit steeper here on the north

1 face with a three-to-one slope. It's an area now that
2 drives down into the area where the gun range used to be.
3 This is your Quarry Road houses over here on this side.

4 The final may look a little different than
5 this. But this gives you an idea of what we're thinking
6 of.

7 This little slide tells you what to expect
8 during construction, work hours, basically 7:00 to 6:00.
9 There will be noise control plans, there will be dust
10 control plans, health and safety plans for the workers,
11 some of the various construction and those types of
12 things.

13 Recreational trails through the area will
14 have to be rerouted. They hope to start this summer.

15 This is the traffic plan that's proposed
16 right now. There will be an estimated 1,800 trucks to
17 haul things out.

18 There will be no entry through the
19 residential gates. Everything's primarily left through
20 Barnard Avenue off Hicks Field.

21 If there's any questions about things
22 during construction, there's the public affairs
23 department through the whole time, or you can also call
24 Radhika or the project manager. They're always open to
25 receive a call if there's a problem or something going

1 on.

2 After remediation -- this is not part of
3 the post-remediation site restoration process, and we
4 through the department and the trust have plans for post-
5 remediation project. This is separate from the
6 remediation project.

7 And this is how to submit comments. I'm
8 pretty sure we're done.

9 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you, Perry.

10 So I will go one more similar comment.
11 Comments are welcome right now. Again, everything will
12 be on the record. Please say your first and last name
13 clearly and followed by your comments.

14 If you do not wish to speak tonight, again
15 either hand us a comment card tonight or you can also
16 e-mail Virginia or mail us the comment card or even you
17 could write your comment on white paper. That's okay,
18 too.

19 So any questions before we move on to the
20 comment round? Yes.

21 MS. BLUM: How do you tell what the cost
22 will be on an ongoing basis?

23 MR. MYERS: Cost?

24 MS. BLUM: Thirty years of monitoring
25 should be fairly expensive, or are you just talking

1 thirty years of monitoring?

2 MR. MYERS: Typically a three-year period
3 is what we work out cost. That's what you would throw in
4 for that portion of it.

5 You would look at your expected wear and
6 tear on the cover, how often you replace soils, fill in
7 pieces. You would look at your monitoring costs.

8 What are you looking for, how much the
9 groundwater, how many samples are we doing for landfill
10 gas and piece all that out, and yeah, turn it into
11 present value dollars because there's inflation factors.

12 MS. BLUM: Even though you're inflating
13 the future cost, you're calculating that into the future
14 because that's the number you're using today or is that
15 today's number?

16 MR. MYERS: I'm not -- other than being
17 normalized. You can do it several ways. So you want to
18 be comparing apples to apples.

19 If you're calculating O&M costs for each of
20 the remedies like the removal and haul remedy is what we
21 call total removal. So if you have some monitoring with
22 that and some other factors that may only go out a few
23 years. You calculate that value of that.

24 If you're long-term monitoring over thirty
25 years, obviously there should be some escalators built

1 in. Where we're figuring some other costs, you included
2 some kind of inflation, all future dollars and all
3 present dollars so you're comparing the same numbers
4 together, basically.

5 MS. BLUM: How much of your 3.5 million is
6 landfill repair or capping and how much is O&M long-term?

7 MR. MYERS: I do not know.

8 MS. BLUM: Is it a formulaic situation?

9 MR. MYERS: There will be 1,500 truckloads
10 full of --

11 MS. BLUM: It seems like it would be
12 astronomically expensive going across the bridge.

13 MR. MYERS: That's part of the
14 construction.

15 MS. BLUM: So that's not included in the
16 3.5 million?

17 MR. MYERS: I believe it is, but we'll
18 have to check.

19 MS. BLUM: Pardon?

20 MR. MYERS: I said I believe it is, but
21 we'll have to check. I don't have all the details of the
22 cost estimate in my head. Sorry.

23 MS. BLUM: Is it normal to pull something
24 that is not fully complete?

25 MR. MYERS: I didn't say it was not fully

1 complete. I'm just checking whether the O&M is included
2 or if that 3.5 million is just the construction cost to
3 complete remedial action. I don't know if the O&M costs
4 are tied into that, also.

5 MS. BLUM: But in any event, you're
6 comparing with the same thing, clean closure and the cap,
7 comparing the same values.

8 It would be valuable to know whether they
9 we're looking at the total costs or part of the costs.

10 MR. MYERS: Yes, ma'am.

11 MS. BLUM: Once it's clean, it's clean
12 forever, and if you've capping it, you have long-term O&M
13 and expense.

14 MR. MYERS: We'll have to look into it to
15 clarify and we'll cover that in our response to your
16 comment.

17 MS. MAJHAIL: Could you spell -- could you
18 say your first and last name clearly?

19 MS. BLUM: I'm Jan Blum. Thank you.

20 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you.

21 Any other comments or questions for
22 tonight? If there are no more comments or questions, I
23 call this meeting.

24 Off the record. Thank you.

25

1 MS. BLUM: Jan Blum again. Just for the
2 record, I'm wondering what the process of outreach is.

3 MS. MAJHAIL: The fact sheet was mailed
4 out.

5 MS. BLUM: To?

6 MS. MAJHAIL: To the entire mailing list
7 for the Presidio Trust.

8 MS. BLUM: How many people is that?

9 MS. FANELLI: I believe it's about 1,500
10 people.

11 MS. MAJHAIL: So the fact sheet was mailed
12 out and a public notice was also run in the newspaper on
13 the first day of the public comment period and notifying
14 about the meeting.

15 MS. BLUM: Specifically our neighbors in
16 the immediate neighborhood are sought out so you can
17 inform them?

18 MS. MAJHAIL: Yes. The Quarry Lane, the
19 residents on the Quarry Lane, a specifying letter for
20 those people were actually e-mailed to them notifying
21 them of this meeting, as well.

22 MS. BLUM: Are all the residents on the
23 Presidio advised to what's happening with remediation or
24 just selected?

25 MS. FANELLI: All residents receive

1 copies.

2 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: -- of the flyer. That's on
4 the back, the post plan.

5 MS. BLUM: And do you know how many people
6 those represent as opposed to the general public who
7 doesn't live on the Presidio?

8 MS. FANELLI: I don't know the number of
9 residents, to be honest, but we sent it out to all
10 residents. We also sent to a certain number of blocks
11 that will go to the entire perimeter of the Presidio, as
12 well.

13 But we can ask Public Affairs.

14 MS. BLUM: I think it would be worthwhile
15 knowing that, because it's such a small turnout, it seems
16 like there's not very much outreach or is it sufficient
17 to really get enough feedback.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. Anything else?

20 MR. MYERS: One clarification, Perry
21 Myers. The O&M costs are included in the 3.5 million
22 dollar estimate. So that's construction plus O&M for
23 thirty years.

24 Each of the alternatives that are
25 operations and maintenance, that cost is figured into the

1 total cost that was shown on the slides.

2 MS. BLUM: Do you happen to know how
3 much -- what percent the O&M is of the total cost?
4 Roughly.

5 MR. MYERS: I'm only looking at this
6 because I don't have glasses here. It's about 880,000 of
7 the 3.5 million.

8 MS. BLUM: For O&M?

9 MR. MYERS: Right.

10 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

11 MR. MYERS: It's Appendix D in the RAP.

12 MS. BLUM: And is that for thirty years?

13 MR. MYERS: That's what it says here. All
14 right.

15 MS. MAJHAIL: All right. Any further
16 questions? Any more comments?

17 I'll officially end the meeting. Off the
18 record. Thank you.

19 (The meeting concluded at 7:42 PM).

20 ---o0o---

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3
4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
9 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
10 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
11 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
12 action.

13
14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
15 hereunto set my hand this
16 _____day of _____,
17 2011.

18
19 _____
20 MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527
21
22
23
24
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2010

OFFICER'S CLUB, BUILDING 50

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

4 Eileen Fanelli

Brian Ullensvang

5 Agnes Farres

Julie Cheever

6 Gloria Gee

Sam Berman

7 Jan Blum

8 Special Guest:

9 Mike Beck

10 ---o0o---

11

12

13

14

15

16 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
17 of the Meeting, and on April 12, 2011, 7:12 PM at the
18 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
19 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
20 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
21 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

22 ---o0o---

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4 Reports and Discussions - Eileen Fanelli	
7	A. Status Update of Ongoing Projects	4
8	B. Building 228 In-Situ Thermal Treatment	39, 52
9	C. Draft FS/RAP Landfill E Comment Letter	50
10	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
11	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
12	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB	51
13	6) New Business - None	
14	7) Public Comment - None	
15	8) Action Items and Agenda Items	73
16	9) Adjournment:	73

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I'd like to welcome
2 everyone. There may be a little bit of sound coming in
3 from the party over there.

4 MS. FANELLI: I'm going to close these
5 doors.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I'd like to welcome
7 everyone tonight to the Presidio Trust, the contractors,
8 National Park Service, the regulators, Water Board and
9 the public RAB members. Thank you very much for being
10 here tonight.

11 Does everyone have an agenda? Are there
12 any changes? Seeing none, are there any announcements?

13 Then we may as well proceed with item 4,
14 Discussions and Presentations, and I'm not sure if you'd
15 like to start with A or B, but I see that --

16 MS. FANELLI: I just put a cookie in my
17 mouth, and I actually didn't review the agenda
18 beforehand. My apology, so let's let Mike go and do B,
19 and I can think about the pertinent things that are
20 ongoing projects.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

22 MR. BECK: All right. So I'm Mike Beck.
23 I think I've spoken to this group before, so you may
24 recognize me, but I'm here tonight to talk about 207/ 231
25 area, and more specifically the historic wall interface

1 within that larger area.

2 So I've got a map on the wall that shows
3 the greater 207/231 area, which was described in the cap
4 and cap work plan in 2007/2008 time frame.

5 It shows a couple areas with impacted soil
6 and groundwater, petroleum hydrocarbons that are the
7 primary constituents, both the Water Board site, and we
8 actually remediated the 207 excavation area last year.

9 I think I was here talking about that
10 excavation at that time. That was north along Main
11 Street, and the plan for the remainder of the soil
12 excavation areas is to -- is to do most of the excavation
13 work in 2012 now.

14 The Doyle Drive project is obviously going
15 right through here and we're working with Caltrans to
16 coordinate that.

17 We initially thought we would be doing it
18 this summer. It didn't work logistically, so it looks
19 like it will happen next year.

20 I will talk about the historic wall area.
21 You can see the wall there just north of 228 along
22 Halleck Street, and there's a picture of the wall itself
23 with Halleck Street in the background and looking at 228
24 on the left-hand side.

25 There were three underground storage tanks

1 formerly located between the building, 228 and the
2 retaining wall, about seventeen feet of space there.

3 The Army removed them in the '90s, and they
4 contain a solvent that was used for dry cleaning
5 operations that occurred in that building.

6 The tanks leaked and petroleum hydrocarbons
7 and gasoline have been detected and are in groundwater in
8 the area.

9 So you may recall from the previous photo
10 that there's a large excavation that extends north of
11 this area, which is right on the screen.

12 So the planned cap was to do -- institute
13 chemical oxidation to remediate the waste in the
14 immediate area of the former tanks, and there is going to
15 be a five foot setback and it will slope down and we will
16 do the excavation.

17 The reason for doing the in situ work is
18 just because it's really difficult to excavate and
19 maintain historical structure. The goal here is to not
20 damage the wall and not damage the building and make the
21 remediation complete.

22 So we became involved a couple years ago,
23 and one of the first things we did is try to do some
24 additional work to characterize the extent.

25 The cap had been written and the extent of

1 the impact, and there's actually -- the lighter rectangle
2 right around the three circles which -- represent the
3 tank and another rectangle on the other side of the dark
4 line represents the retaining wall is the area that was
5 expected to be remediated with chemical oxidation, and
6 what we found -- the cap did notice and did note that the
7 extent hadn't been defined in the east and west or to the
8 south.

9 So as part of the cap, we ended up doing
10 that, and we found that the area was much larger and more
11 extensive than was originally thought.

12 We went more to the east and the west, not
13 so much to the south, but concentrations were fairly
14 high. We detected THP gasoline at thirty parts per
15 million. We found not so much, but the machine.

16 It was not measurable, but machine free
17 product in the groundwater on several occasions, even
18 outside the area that was originally in the remediation
19 area.

20 So that extended the area of concern. We
21 also noted that south of the retaining wall, the impacts
22 are almost entirely THP in the gasoline range, which is
23 the Stoddard solvent.

24 North of the retaining wall, some diesel
25 motor oil was detected, and that's likely related to

1 the --

2 MS. BLUM: I'm sorry. Is north -- I'm
3 having a hard time following your --

4 MR. BECK: North is up.

5 MS. BLUM: Can you show us? Where's the
6 bay?

7 MR. BECK: The bay up this way. This is
8 the retaining wall. The former tanks were here. This is
9 the area that was originally thought to be the
10 remediation area, and now we're thinking it's more like
11 this.

12 Does that help?

13 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

14 So that's about twice as large, isn't it?

15 MR. BECK: Or more, yeah.

16 MS. BLUM: Okay.

17 MR. BECK: As I was saying, so primarily
18 the solvent was up to the wall, and north there are some
19 diesel and motor oil impacts, most likely related to the
20 former tanks and other activities that occurred in former
21 building 231, which is kind of off in a straight line.

22 MS. BLUM: Can you point out where Mason
23 Street is here?

24 MR. BECK: Yeah. Let me go back to the
25 bigger -- Mason Street's quite a ways off. So we're

1 Down -- we're just showing this area right here. So the
2 former building 231's right here. This is the larger 231
3 excavation that's going to occur, and we're right in
4 here.

5 So basically up here, this excavation last
6 summer and now we're here.

7 MS. BLUM: Mason would be that straight
8 line, not curved line?

9 MR. BECK: Yeah. That is Mason. This is
10 Doyle Drive overpass and --

11 MS. BLUM: I'm still trying --

12 MR. BECK: So this is Borges coming
13 through here just south of the main Doyle Drive. Just
14 south of that.

15 So the excavation that is going to happen
16 next summer in this area will extend beyond Bourgas, all
17 the way from here to beyond Bourgas, and this building
18 will be removed shortly and there is another definition
19 on here.

20 MR. BERMAN: So is it your expectation
21 that the extent to be extended will be associated with
22 the three original tanks or is it associated with other
23 things that were built out further?

24 MR. BECK: That's a good question. So the
25 question is is the area bigger because the tanks were

1 leaking more on the side or is there something else going
2 on?

3 So the area extended mostly in this
4 direction. We didn't look here because we know it's not
5 impacted to the north.

6 It didn't extend much further south, and we
7 did a geophysical survey. We were worried that we had
8 missed something during the characterization stage.

9 So we did a geophysical survey and we
10 didn't find any anomalies that would indicate a tank or
11 drums or anything like that.

12 So it is my judgment that the impacts are
13 related to the tanks, and I think the retaining wall had
14 something to do with it.

15 We normally don't get that much movement
16 across groundwater. Groundwater's flowing into the bay,
17 but I think it's acting like a dam and has some impact
18 behind it.

19 MR. BERMAN: How deep is it?

20 MR. BECK: That's another thing that we --
21 that we found. It extends a few feet below the top of
22 the water table.

23 Petroleum hydrocarbons float, and it's
24 essentially petroleum hydrocarbon. It doesn't extend
25 more than a few feet into the groundwater.

1 The next slide shows a cross-section. So
2 what we found -- in addition to being larger, we found a
3 couple other things. We found the bottom, which is
4 pretty continuous layer of clay in this area.

5 The dashed lines here are -- is our
6 estimate of the extent of the impact based on samples in
7 some cases and then PIE screening tool results, and what
8 we found is there were some low level PIE hits down in
9 this sandy area here, but that clay did not have any
10 petroleum hydrocarbons in them.

11 And the groundwater table is -- I doubt if
12 you can see here, but it's about here. It moves up and
13 down kind of right about the bottom of the wall and right
14 above that. So the impacts are in shallow groundwater.

15 MS. BLUM: This is the area called
16 Quartermaster Reach, isn't it?

17 MR. BECK: Yes.

18 MS. BLUM: I see.

19 MR. BECK: And that's important because
20 the wetland is going to be extended, and the ultimate
21 goal here is to protect the receptors in that marsh.

22 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

23 MR. BECK: So -- so the other thing that
24 the cross-section shows is that we have layers of clay
25 and sand and clay and sand, and that's problematic with

1 the in situ injection technology, like chemical oxidation
2 that is in the plan.

3 You can work with it sometimes, but a lot
4 of times what will happen when you start injecting, most
5 of it goes into the sand, you can't get into the clay.

6 A lot of times the chemicals in the clay
7 will come out when the oxidation goes away and you get a
8 rebound. That's something we were worried about.

9 But since we were doing the additional
10 investigation work, we did some bench scale testing of
11 some oxidents, and we had some disappointing results
12 there, too.

13 We were able to get results in the lab with
14 the chemical oxidents that we were using, but we were
15 unable to keep a low cleanup level, and our feeling is if
16 you can't get below cleanup goals in the lab, you're
17 going to have a hard time doing it in the field because
18 it's difficult to translate. The logistical issues and
19 the real issues.

20 So that was disappointing. The larger area
21 also came into play, just the scale of doing that.

22 So the trust -- we came up -- the trust
23 asked us to look at excavation one more time. It had
24 originally been ruled out because it was thought to be
25 difficult, but we said, "Well, let's do whatever we can."

1 Let's see if we can do it."

2 It really -- the bottom line is we looked
3 at a bunch of different shoring strategy, but it's really
4 hard to come up with something that you can guarantee
5 that there isn't going to be damage at all in-structures
6 that are already weak, and there's very little cause for
7 vibration. And so that just didn't look good.

8 The other thing about excavation, it wasn't
9 feasible to excavate a chunk of material that's directly
10 below the wall right into the wall, so we will have to
11 leave some material in place. So that wasn't looking
12 good.

13 So we came across another technology. It's
14 a thermo remediation, electrical resistant heating. It's
15 a thermal remediation process. I've got a couple
16 diagrams here to show you generally how it works.

17 It involves installing electrodes in the
18 ground and passing current between the electrodes and the
19 resistance in the soil which actually generates the heat.

20 So there's other thermo radiation where you
21 actually put heaters in the ground and heat the heaters
22 and it radiates up.

23 In this case, you're passing current
24 between is the electrodes and using the natural
25 resistance in the ground to create heat up to a hundred

1 degrees C, up to the boiling point in the water.

2 The technology wouldn't work if there was
3 no water in the ground. You couldn't get the current to
4 pass through.

5 So it gets to the boiling point of water
6 and it generates steam and it uses the steam as a
7 carrier gas to strip out the volatile constituents.

8 It's good for things like solvent, which --
9 they used it for dry cleaning, so it's good for that
10 technology, and it's also something that works well in
11 clays, which is unusual for in situ technology.

12 The conductance of the clay helps. It's
13 something that we want to look in to.

14 So after the heat goes through and
15 generates the steam and carries the chemicals out of the
16 saturated soil, you deflect, collect it, so this
17 technology involves either vertical extraction wells that
18 are shown here, or horizontal trenching to suck the
19 airborne contaminants out of the ground and treat them up
20 above ground.

21 This shows something like a carbon can, you
22 use granular carbon. In our case, we use a thermo
23 oxidizer to destroy the chemical.

24 The technology's good in the sense that it
25 does remove it, destroys the chemical and we'll get that

1 going for us.

2 But it works for the volatile constituents,
3 but for the diesel and motor oil that we detected in some
4 parts of the site, it doesn't work, as well.

5 Those non-volatile constituents can
6 actually affect the ability to pull volatiles out. It
7 will actually hinder the ability for it to work as well.
8 We're concerned about that.

9 Actually, naturally occurring organics like
10 bay mud can also hinder the technology.

11 So witness we looked at it, we wanted to
12 make sure that it will work on our site, so we did some
13 bench scale testing of this technology, also. I just
14 want to touch on what we did just briefly.

15 Essentially we collected a sample of soil
16 from above the wall where we knew it was primarily
17 Stoddard solvent, another sample below the wall in an
18 area where we knew there was quite a bit of diesel and
19 motor oil.

20 We kind of knew what kind of soil we would
21 be getting, and this slide actually shows the results for
22 the sample that was collected, primarily Stoddard
23 solvent.

24 What we did is we took the sample to the
25 lab and we put a knowing amount of energy into the

1 samples, heating them, and we did the soil concentration,
2 and you can see the more energy, the less result in
3 concentration is, with real good news.

4 A hundred parts per million of TPHg, and
5 that was good and totally expected because of the fact
6 that there wasn't any non-volatiles present.

7 North of the wall, you can see the
8 chromatogram on the right-hand side. The stuff is in the
9 oil, ranging from the diesel motor oil range, so we did
10 the same thing here, and the good news on that is that we
11 were able to remove the gasoline.

12 The graph didn't make it down to the
13 cleanup level of a hundred, but there's -- we're
14 confident that we can do that.

15 There was slight reductions in diesel, but
16 that is expected. It didn't really -- it wouldn't go
17 away.

18 So just in summary, what we were able to
19 take away from the bench testing with TRS, which is our
20 vendor, basically they organized into three different
21 areas based on those results, but what they found is
22 we're going to be able to get the cleanup goals for THPg
23 In 75 to a hundred days is their estimate, various
24 amounts of energy to be injected into certain areas of
25 the site, but we're expecting over 99 percent removal to

1 meet our cleanup goals for TPHg, and we also -- although
2 the technology didn't remove motor oil and diesel really
3 directly, we do expect some -- a handsome remediation due
4 to the elevated temperatures.

5 They've seen -- this is a slide that I got
6 from our vendor TRS, and they do this all over the
7 country. They've seen -- I guess there's two areas that
8 I guess we should pay more attention to.

9 Petrophillic bacteria are shown in this
10 line and this line from two different sites, and in both
11 faces, there were one hundred times or fifty times
12 increases in the amount of those bacteria which are
13 present.

14 They like the heat. They don't die when
15 they are boiled. They -- they -- they survive and they
16 come back and they actually thrive and come down a little
17 bit.

18 So the same is true with other microbes
19 that help with chlorinated solvents, but our site is
20 dealing with petroleum, so it works with the ones that
21 are relevant.

22 But the fact is there is -- we're probably
23 going to need land use control to deal with diesel and
24 motor oil, but there's no way to know for sure that
25 they're going to degrade completely over time.

1 Even under the current conditions out
2 there, there isn't a lot of diesel and motor oil, the
3 CULs. Even before the excavation that happens. The
4 gasoline gets into groundwater easily. It's very mobile.
5 It's definitely what we want to get out.

6 Motor oil is less mobile and that's seen by
7 the fact that we're not getting dry water in the current
8 conditions.

9 MR. BERMAN: Quick question.

10 MR. BECK: Yeah.

11 MR. BERMAN: The petrophillic material,
12 was that seen with diesel?

13 MR. BECK: They will work on diesel.
14 Diesel and motor oil. Those bacteria will, and that's
15 the point. We will have more of them present, like a few
16 months after remediation while it's cooling back down.

17 So the remediation area will stay hot for
18 several months to a year after remediation takes place,
19 and that's when we should be able to take advantage of
20 the bacteria.

21 MR. BERMAN: If it were really hot, the
22 bacteria, to normally do the trenching put it in there
23 and accelerate the process.

24 MR. BECK: Put it in there, you're
25 suggesting. There should be sufficient number of

1 bacteria present to do what we need to have happen.

2 MS. BLUM: You started off with addressing
3 the Doyle Drive situation with the situation, and I know
4 that I've heard the story, my question is: Will -- it's
5 either the Doyle Drive process or this process going to
6 slow down either one? Will the hole be dug in time and
7 will the Doyle Drive be -- is there any delay in
8 finishing up this and that?

9 MR. BECK: It doesn't look like there's
10 going to be any delay in either. We're doing this work
11 now. They got delayed for a while, which you're probably
12 aware of, and that's worked out fine for our schedule.

13 We figured out now how to address it. It
14 took sometime to do that, and now that we know what we
15 want to do, you know, we're going to do this over the
16 course of the summer. We'll talk about schedule later.

17 We should be finished by fall with this
18 work. That's before Caltrans is going to be doing any
19 significant work in that area, and as far as timing of
20 the excavation work, we're working with them to make sure
21 that we can do it in a manner that's what they want to do
22 and what we want to do, so -- without -- yeah.

23 Without Caltrans, we may have tried to do
24 the excavation work this year, but it didn't work out.
25 So maybe that delayed the excavation work, but it will

1 happen in time.

2 MS. FANELLI: It did not delay the -- in
3 terms of the insurance policy. I can't say Caltrans is
4 not delayed. Caltrans is a good year behind their
5 overall mission schedule, but I'm not worried about that
6 schedule.

7 It's not going to impact our ability to
8 complete the program substantially by 2014.

9 MR. BERMAN: If you saturated the area
10 with petrophillic bacteria, could you actually eliminate
11 the diesel completely so that you wouldn't have to do the
12 controls?

13 MR. BECK: I'm not sure that actually
14 adding bacteria will help. I think if -- it sounds good,
15 but to get them into the formation, that's the areas
16 where they can be.

17 The beauty of what I'm showing here is that
18 it will take the bacteria which already presumably is
19 evenly distributed and help them grow themselves.

20 If we tried to put them in the ground, it's
21 hard to get them distributed well and it may not help.

22 MR. BERMAN: Compared to the cost of the
23 controls of inserting bacteria is probably a quarter of a
24 magnitude cheaper.

25 MR. BECK: That's right.

1 MS. BLUM: Can you explain the
2 investigation of the tide line and the bay? And we have
3 predicted four feet of sea rise before the end of the
4 century.

5 Will you also take that into projected
6 water level on, say, the retaining wall and the other
7 areas?

8 MR. BECK: So I complete the work that I
9 do, generally, we're trying to remove a problem that we
10 know about in current conditions.

11 So the sea level rise that you're talking
12 about doesn't necessarily affect us unless we were
13 leaving something in -- set on which presumably
14 groundwater will rise over time.

15 In our case, we're going to remove
16 everything from the area both below and above the water
17 table. So -- and/or excavating. So sea level rise
18 doesn't really affect that.

19 Now, with respect to the retaining wall
20 itself, I'm not sure if that was the clearest part of the
21 EIF work that was done as part of the Doyle Drive
22 project. I do know that.

23 The wall is old and rickety. There's going
24 to be a large freeway ten feet south of the wall in the
25 future at about the same elevation, and so if a sea level

1 rise affects the wall, it's going to affect the Doyle
2 Drive work.

3 MS. BLUM: You're looking backwards.

4 MR. BECK: That's kind of how I see that.

5 So in any case, so we took the results of
6 everything I said before and concluded that the minimal
7 remediation technology that I talked about is really the
8 only thing that we've seen that can remove the gasoline
9 and hydrocarbons to below safe levels, and that's a major
10 Victory in our mind.

11 So the trust decided to move forward and
12 prepared a work plan, and that was submitted to the Water
13 Board in March.

14 MS. FANELLI: And you guys all got a copy
15 of it. I forwarded it to you.

16 MR. BECK: And I won't read all the full.
17 It kind of lays out the chemical and issues I've already
18 talked about, but it also describes the 41 electrodes
19 that will be installed and collocated vapor recover
20 wells, some vertical wells and some horizontal wells, and
21 the thermal oxidizer for vapor treat.

22 We had initially thought it will be gas
23 powered. It will be electrically powered is the only
24 difference from the work plan that I submitted.

25 In general, we're going to achieve a design

1 of below one hundred milligrams out there, and the layout
2 of the site will look like this. I'm not sure how well
3 this shows up up here.

4 So the design is still ongoing, so it's
5 subject to change, but the general thought is -- definite
6 thought is it will be four rows of electrodes, two
7 between the buildings and the wall and two others up here
8 to get the electricity into the ground.

9 The wells down here will be collocated with
10 vertical extraction wells that will actually be part of
11 the same well, and to remove the vapor, will be the same
12 wells, whereas north of the wall, there will be two large
13 trenches where there'll be a horizontal pipe and to pull
14 the vapors out of the ground that way.

15 It has to do with the fact that the water
16 is very shallow up here and the vertical wells were too
17 much.

18 So we're going to install that
19 infrastructure. There will be temperature monitoring
20 points here and, then here's the utility to make sure we
21 protect the utilities.

22 Right now the design is ongoing and we're
23 also dealing with utilities, making sure we can get the
24 power that we need to the site, and I should mention that
25 once the vapors are extracted, they'll be cooled and the

1 water will be collected in the water tank and water will
2 condense out and it will be oxidized and monitored right
3 there.

4 Right now the plan is to begin in May and
5 then be operational in June, and it will be done in 75 or
6 a hundred days based on the bench scale study.

7 We will be doing -- we're planning to do
8 some samples about two-thirds of the way through the
9 project. We're going to collect some samples and see --
10 we may find, for example, that two-thirds of the way
11 through the project, we're clean up here and we can
12 direct more energy to another area.

13 So we're going to do samples to see how
14 we're doing, and then once we can extrapolate forward and
15 see what's there, we can do a second round of samples to
16 see what happened.

17 MR. BERMAN: Is there any chance that the
18 vapors could escape the collection wells?

19 MR. BECK: Yeah. So -- good question.
20 We're going to be placing plastic sheeting. It shouldn't
21 happen because the vacuum that we're planning to utilize
22 there should keep the steam out of the ground, but we're
23 going to mitigate that and put some plastic over the
24 ground.

25 In fact, on the north side, we're also

1 insulating the ground. The ground is so shallow, there's
2 heat loss, and so we're going to put that over the
3 surface and we'll be watching for that.

4 MR. BERMAN: Under the plastic, you'll
5 have some type of meter that's making some kind of cap on
6 whether the vapors are there?

7 MR. BECK: No, we won't be measuring that,
8 because it will just be lying on the ground. It's really
9 just a seal to make sure that it doesn't come up.

10 It will be under vacuum, so that air will
11 be flowing in the right direction. And so it's just --
12 we really shouldn't need it, but we're going to put it
13 there just to be safe.

14 MR. BERMAN: But since you're doing it,
15 because -- just to be sure, you don't want to monitor
16 just to be --

17 MR. BECK: We'll monitor what's coming out
18 above.

19 MR. BERMAN: Oh, will you?

20 MR. BECK: Yeah, but we're not planning to
21 monitor what's underneath.

22 MR. BERMAN: So you want to make sure that
23 the integrity of the plastic is maintained, that there
24 isn't a porous area?

25 MR. BECK: Absolutely. We'll be onsite.

1 There will be an air permit from the Air Board because
2 there is a discharge into the area and we'll make sure
3 that we're meeting the Air Board's requirements and we'll
4 be present to look for things like that, and we'll be
5 monitoring the temperature to make sure that we're
6 getting the temperature that we're expecting and make
7 sure that there's adjustments.

8 Yes.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Can you speak to -- are
10 there any other safety issues like putting electricity in
11 the ground? That was one of the things we speculated on
12 before you came tonight.

13 MR. BECK: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Is that -- is there a
15 situation where you could cause an explosion, for
16 example?

17 MR. BECK: Yeah. Okay. We shouldn't have
18 any problems with explosions. This work -- I took out a
19 few photos that TRS had in the presentation that they
20 gave to the trust that they do this stuff under buildings
21 all over the country. It's widely done.

22 I'm not an electrical engineer, so I can't
23 describe to you exactly why they can put so much energy
24 in the ground and it's not a problem.

25 I can tell you that it's not, and they look

1 for that and they do test for electricity that's kind of
2 moving in directions that you don't want it to go, but
3 it's commonly done and that's never been a problem.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Just venting out loud
5 is the possibility of having one of these probes near
6 some buried pipe and electricity somehow being directed
7 towards a pipe and then being directed away from the site
8 towards something else and acting as conductor. Just
9 unexpected events.

10 MR. BECK: Yeah. So what's happening
11 physically -- again, I'm not an electrical engineer, but
12 I do understand that each of the electrodes has a
13 different phase.

14 If you've heard of three-phase power,
15 they're actually strategically facing the different
16 phases across their grid and running electricity that
17 way, and the ground around that acts as a ground, and so
18 it's a really good insulator, so that really can't
19 happen.

20 You won't get fugitive electricity going
21 down the pipe.

22 We are concerned about -- with damage of
23 the utilities to heat, and so we looked if there's a gas
24 line that goes through there, for example, and they tell
25 me that you can actually do this in the presence of a gas

1 line, but it makes me nervous, and in reality, the
2 material from the pipe can't handle the temperature, and
3 so we're going to cut the cap ahead of time.

4 There's a sanitary sewer line that goes
5 through there that's got a small segment that's prepared.
6 That will melt, and so we're going to replace it when
7 we're done.

8 So we're looking into the utilities and how
9 to mitigate that.

10 There's a -- telecommunication lines that
11 travels through the extreme western part towards the
12 wall. We're actually going to -- we're not going to be
13 able to mediate all the way to the wall. We'll be seven
14 feet short.

15 MR. BUDROE: Your power source for the
16 resistant feeding? It's going to be power corded or
17 stand-alone diesel generator?

18 MR. BECK: It will be power cord, and the
19 trust has hired an electrical engineer to design the
20 improvements needed to get the power to the site and
21 transform it down to the voltage.

22 So that's ongoing, and that should be up
23 and running by June 1st.

24 MR. BERMAN: Can you say again what the
25 total power to be delivered to the area?

1 MR. BECK: Yeah. So it's somewhere around
2 600,000 kilowatt hours.

3 MR. BERMAN: What's the capacity?

4 MR. BECK: The capacity?

5 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. How many kilowatts,
6 not kilowatt hours?

7 MR. BERMAN: I actually don't know the
8 answer to that question. I'd have to do the math.

9 MR. BERMAN: 600 kilowatt hours --

10 MR. BECK: Times three months.

11 MR. BERMAN: 24 hours a day.

12 MR. BECK: Yeah. It will be running full-
13 time.

14 MR. BERMAN: That's not really a very high
15 demand.

16 MR. BECK: Yeah. It's something that we
17 can get out. We didn't have to make any improvements to
18 the grid. The power was there.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Is there any remote
20 monitoring? I assume that there's not going to be
21 somebody there 24 hours.

22 MR. BECK: Right.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: If something happened
24 at 3:00 in the morning, is there some type of alarm that
25 would notify you?

1 MR. BECK: Yeah. And there's all sorts of
2 controls. I answered your safety question. It went
3 well, we haven't had any problems. There are safety
4 concerns.

5 There's cable laying across the ground, and
6 cable is very attractive to people who want to steal
7 cable and sell copper.

8 So they thought of that, and if you start
9 messaging with it, it will shut the power off, and not only
10 that, there will be fence around the entire area and
11 there'll be an alarm on the fence that shuts down the
12 power -- if someone did try to get across the fence, it
13 will shut off the power, and there's all sort of
14 monitoring.

15 We don't want to have people onsite, even
16 everyday when it gets going full scale, and the
17 temperature will be monitored remotely, the controls of
18 the -- of the control unit will be observed remotely, and
19 it's really the only way to do something like this that
20 really doesn't require too much hands-on operation.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: It certainly seems
22 promising with the gasoline part of it from your tests.

23 MR. BECK: Right.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: We have had a situation
25 where we did dig something out and I think it was down at

1 637, and then we noticed petroleum products flowing into
2 the marsh and we had to go back in and find where that
3 was coming from, but presumably that would happen in this
4 case if you got done and then dug it out and then it
5 starts flowing.

6 The sink and stuff could be drawn into the
7 marsh, but we'll have to see.

8 MR. BECK: Yeah. I mean, we'll be digging
9 to the north. So we will be overlapping with the area
10 that we're treating, so we'll get an opportunity to see
11 the soil being remediated.

12 We're not expecting too much, but we'll
13 see.

14 MS. BLUM: I have a question, Eileen.

15 What does this do to the estimated cost of
16 this particular area?

17 MS. FANELLI: That was a question that I
18 kept putting a lot of pressure on Mike to help answer
19 where we were doing a lot of bench scale analysis.

20 This cost estimate compares pretty much the
21 same, maybe a little bit less than the excavation.

22 All of them are about a million dollars by
23 the time we're all said and done. So the estimation --
24 cost estimates were the time that we had to drive sheet
25 pile very carefully and excavate.

1 Those costs came up to that magic million
2 dollar number. This started at about, oh, 700,000.
3 We've tacked on dollars here and there for the electrical
4 contractor, the power cost, et cetera, but we're still
5 somewhere on the order of about a million dollars when
6 we're all said and done with this.

7 And the chemical elements, that oxidation,
8 I think those price anywhere from a half million to a
9 little bit less, but when we looked at it it might not be
10 effective and we have to do secondary rounds, et cetera,
11 it probably would have cost about the same and it was
12 clearly not going to be as effective. So that's why we
13 went with this.

14 MR. BERMAN: This looks like a very clever
15 technology. I hope it works.

16 MS. FANELLI: Me, too, yeah.

17 MS. BLUM: It's an excellent opportunity
18 for kids to learn about science.

19 MR. BECK: Yeah. It's not what you would
20 call a -- it's a proven technology. It's not
21 experimental, and it is the first site that I've been
22 involved in, so I'm looking forward -- personally
23 involved with.

24 We've done plenty with the firm, so I look
25 forward to it.

1 MR. BERMAN: The power requirement is very
2 modest given the area. It's just surprising that --
3 there must not be a lot of water in the soil.

4 MR. BECK: Well, it's saturated, yeah, and
5 it requires the water to help the current.

6 MR. BERMAN: It has to vaporize the steam.

7 MR. BECK: Yeah.

8 MR. BERMAN: What is the estimate of the
9 volume of water in there?

10 MR. BECK: It would be about thirty
11 percent of the total volume.

12 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. And the total volume
13 again? How much?

14 MR. BECK: It's about a thousand cubic
15 yards, right around a thousand cubic yards.

16 MR. BERMAN: So that's a good amount of
17 water.

18 MR. BECK: Yeah.

19 MR. BERMAN: It's just surprising that you
20 can do it because -- some of that heat is -- it's not
21 that -- I'm just trying to learn about it.

22 What's surprising when you look at the
23 numbers is that the heat doesn't escape the area in order
24 to -- somehow it's really confined to that area.

25 MR. BECK: They do factor in heat loss.

1 MR. BERMAN: That must be pretty small.
2 You're talking about less than a megawatt of power.

3 MR. BECK: It was about 25 to thirty
4 percent of loss. That's speculation. But the ground
5 does insulate very well.

6 They have sites where they've done this
7 at -- well down into the ground, in 25, fifty, 75 feet,
8 and the sites stay hot for a couple years.

9 MR. BERMAN: It looks, you know -- it
10 looks like it's the best of all possibilities given the
11 problems that you have with the excavation. It makes it
12 possible.

13 Would you recommend the solution?

14 MR. BECK: Yeah. I think -- it was a two-
15 year process, you know. We were talking about what to
16 recommend, and we weren't feeling comfortable with
17 chemical oxidation, but I didn't have a technology that I
18 could recommend, and I knew about this technology and
19 we've used it at other sites -- my firm has, and it
20 didn't really become cost-effective until the size of the
21 site grew so much.

22 When the site was smaller, it just wouldn't
23 have worked. It wouldn't have compared to oxidation. We
24 might still be talking about oxidation. You can get a
25 lot of oxidation in a smaller area for the price that you

1 can do this. It's not really cheaper to do this for a
2 smaller site.

3 Once the site grew, this became something
4 that we were interested in, and I thought well, let's
5 find out how it does on an immense scale, and we felt
6 excited.

7 At that point, we knew that we would use
8 it.

9 MR. BERMAN: So do you think that as a
10 result of this, there's going to be relatively long-term
11 heating of the groundwater?

12 MR. BECK: Yeah. Every site's different,
13 but what we're expecting the dozen sites that TRS has
14 done to have the ambient temperature reached anywhere
15 from a few months to a year, somewhere in that range.

16 MR. BERMAN: That's when the worms will
17 come back.

18 MR. BECK: The worms will come back. The
19 bacteria will come back before then.

20 MR. BERMAN: The worms won't make it.

21 MR. BECK: They won't make it. That's
22 true.

23 MR. BERMAN: It's a hats-off idea. I hope
24 that it succeeds, economic and a good match for the
25 conditions.

1 MS. BLUM: Going back to Quartermaster
2 Reach, the size of it, maybe you could help me, Brian.
3 It's much larger of an area that we're trying to
4 remediate.

5 MR. BECK: Yes.

6 MS. BLUM: Will this hot spot syndrome
7 that may last for a year affect all of Quartermaster
8 Reach or will it be localized?

9 MR. BECK: Well, Quartermaster's Reach
10 won't be constructed within the one-year period.

11 MS. BLUM: Okay. No problem.

12 MR. BECK: Yeah. We didn't look into, you
13 know, are we going to have hot water going into the bay,
14 for example, and it's just -- the groundwater flows so
15 slow that we can't make it there.

16 So there will be dispersion and it will
17 slow down. The answer is it won't make it.

18 MS. BLUM: Good. Good answer.

19 MR. BECK: Yeah.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Any other questions?

21 MR. BERMAN: Just exploring this idea,
22 which is you got the groundwater sitting there, and this
23 idea seems so powerful. You could have avoided the
24 electrodes by blocking the groundwater and just heating
25 the groundwater directly.

1 Block the groundwater flow to the bay and
2 then shove your electrodes into the initial point
3 according to the slope, et cetera, and then you just boil
4 the groundwater and avoid putting in all those electrodes
5 into the area and --

6 MR. BECK: The problem will be getting
7 into the ground while it's still hot. Again, you're
8 stuck with the problem which most of this technology is
9 hard to get material from above ground into the ground
10 where you want it where the chemicals are.

11 That's the challenge, whereas here, you're
12 seeing the whole thing.

13 MS. FANELLI: Doing the soil and the
14 groundwater at the same time.

15 MR. BERMAN: So groundwater is
16 sufficiently uneven that if you just boiled the
17 groundwater, you wouldn't know that it was --

18 MR. BECK: We are boiling the groundwater.
19 That is what specifically happens.

20 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

21 MR. BECK: Yeah. That's what starts the
22 process. We boil the groundwater, it turns into steam.
23 The steam comes in contact with the Stoddard solvent and
24 it goes up and we collect it.

25 MR. BERMAN: So why not just block the

1 groundwater flow and heat it?

2 MR. BECK: During the heating period, the
3 groundwater flow isn't really significant. It's just a
4 few feet, so we don't really need to do that.

5 In some sites, you actually would get --
6 some sites where there's a lot of groundwater flow, my
7 understanding is you get cool water getting into the zone
8 and it actually creates a problem.

9 We have a better situation where we're just
10 going to heat the water over and over and it will be more
11 efficient for us.

12 MS. BLUM: When you're finished with this
13 whole process, all of the equipment will be removed,
14 including the electrodes, too.

15 Is that right?

16 MR. BECK: Yes. Yeah. We're going to
17 drill it out, drill all the areas out.

18 MS. BLUM: Are they reusable?

19 MR. BECK: We'll be able to recycle them.
20 The -- the electrodes will be twelve inch diameter, and
21 you put a metal rod into them and they backfill around
22 the metal rod with conductive material, graphite.

23 MS. BLUM: These are big.

24 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Very big. You
25 couldn't want to be touching them.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Any other questions?

2 Thanks very much for coming back here and
3 for being here.

4 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Thanks for getting us
5 up to speed here.

6 MS. FANELLI: Back to A, status updates.
7 So I made a few notes while I was listening to Mike, and
8 I'll just step through a few of the most active projects
9 that we're working on.

10 Fillsite 1, landfill 2, we're very close to
11 having final grading plans, and we're looking at a May
12 1st start date for EBI to be back in the field.

13 They will be doing some tweaking to the
14 grading at fillsite 1 based on some final grades that
15 we've developed with our Planning Department, and they
16 will be completing the lower terraces in landfill 2 and
17 then continuing to grade the rest of that site, graded
18 serpentine, and then we're going to backfill more of
19 the -- we're going to fill higher, basically, with
20 terraces and cover.

21 We're going to do something that if you
22 remember from landfill 8, we did, where we had the
23 terraces built on the sandy slopes behind the Wyman
24 Avenue house elsewhere we had that failure, and we
25 basically covered them to make it more conducive for

1 planting for the roots.

2 So we got the double benefit of looser
3 soils for rooting and then the terrace structure
4 basically performing the retaining structure that
5 compaction and other techniques would do that don't
6 coincide or well or don't support, as well the planting
7 aspirations.

8 So the same concept will be applied at
9 landfill 2.

10 We will have heavy erosion pattern by the
11 time we're done, but you won't see the terrace visible
12 once we're finished, but they will be the same design.

13 We're thinking that that work is going to
14 take a couple of months. We are currently stockpiling
15 all the remainder of the soils that we need in place, and
16 hope if the weather stays relatively dry, EBI will be out
17 there in a couple of weeks.

18 We are also preparing some final planting
19 plans in consultation with the Trust Forestry and Natural
20 Resources Department.

21 Those will be a separate set of documents
22 and they'll be bid separately to more of a landscape type
23 firm, and the planting of the sites will occur in the
24 late fall season after an initial rain, and that's when
25 most of the trees will be going in and the plans.

1 So there will be a fair amount of activity in
2 fillsite 1, landfill 2 beginning soon.

3 On landfill 10 -- that will all be done by
4 EBI, the contractor.

5 On landfill 10, we selected ERRG which will
6 be preparing the two little areas under plastic. We're
7 hoping it will begin in June. That's the schedule that
8 we set with them.

9 There's nothing magic about the schedule
10 other than we want the area dry so they can go out there,
11 and we do have additional plants that we will propagate
12 and likely will plant those in the fall, as well, in
13 those two small areas.

14 On Baker Beach 1A, the report was submitted
15 a while ago. We're working on the feasibility study.
16 Our schedule that I sent out in the quarterly report does
17 still have us completing that document in the summer time
18 frame hoping to move on to a RAP in the fall time frame
19 and still target construction in 2012, and I think I
20 mentioned last time I was here that the 2012 date may
21 have a conflict with some of the bridge district 75th
22 anniversary of the bridge.

23 If that's the case, then we will likely
24 postpone until 2013 to do that work to allow the
25 festivities to occur.

1 But I'm still showing it. It's in the
2 calendar on 2012.

3 Baker Beach 2, we just completed a data
4 summary and submitted it. It's under review by the Park
5 Service.

6 Once Brian's had a chance to go through it,
7 we'll meet, but we're hoping that that will serve as the
8 basis for a work plan for some additional
9 characterization of the debris fill that makes up Baker
10 Beach 2 and the metals recycling area that's located
11 adjacent to Baker Beach 2.

12 Once we get that work plan together, we
13 will do that. The construction for that site is still
14 targeted for 2013.

15 We also have Mike working on Battery Wagner
16 and fillsite 6B and Mike is also in the process of
17 preparing a data summary, pulling together all the past
18 historical work that's been done, and then we need to do
19 that.

20 It's been clear to us from DTSC that they
21 need us to pull together a lot of the historical data
22 into a document that they can certify as being a remedial
23 investigation that indeed the site has been
24 characterized.

25 So that's sort of the first process that

1 we've been doing out there.

2 We're going to form them all together in
3 one document, and then we'll hopefully get something
4 submitted after Mike's finished with this project up and
5 going, and late summer time period is what we're looking
6 at for that, those two sites.

7 And landfill B, we're at the public
8 comments. We had the public meeting last Thursday. Jan
9 was there and Doug. I'm sure they talked about it.

10 MS. BLUM: I did bring a copy of the
11 handout. I hope everyone saw that. It was really
12 helpful.

13 MS. FANELLI: I'm going to ask if it's of
14 interest that Virginia e-mail the Power Point slides to
15 the RAB. I can ask if you think it would be helpful.

16 MS. BLUM: I think it would be helpful.
17 Don't you?

18 MS. FANELLI: I know we posted it before
19 on the SharePoint site. I'll ask if we can e-mail a set
20 of them.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Just what we have here is
22 thanks to Jan.

23 MS. BLUM: Thanks to DTSC, and my comment
24 to Virginia was that it would have been very helpful for
25 us. We used to get this kind of thing all the time, and

1 it's always very helpful to summarize it. It would have
2 been very helpful for our comments to have this before
3 the public meeting.

4 There's some things that we learn in the
5 public meeting, which I think is peculiar. This would
6 have been a great help to us early in the process for
7 discussions.

8 MS. FANELLI: The Power Point slides that
9 they use?

10 MS. BLUM: Yes. We used to get these
11 things all the time in discussion.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Not a copy, but a
13 presentation.

14 MS. BLUM: A copy of the presentation. So
15 instead of listening through it, we have notes to follow,
16 as well.

17 I'm sorry for the interruption, but I
18 wanted to make sure that the RAB members were aware of
19 this presentation.

20 MS. FANELLI: Those are the main sites
21 that we're working on right now, so if there's any
22 specific questions. I'm working on getting the quarterly
23 report and it should be issued in mid-May.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: You mentioned the
25 recycling area. I'm not sure if I know where that is.

1 Is that just the new name for something
2 that I know about?

3 MS. FANELLI: I think you should probably
4 know about it. You've been around here longer than I
5 have and it's always been associated with Baker Beach 2.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's part of Baker Beach
7 2.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess I have not
9 known about that name.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: It hasn't generally been
11 called that name, but there were -- the hypothesis of
12 that site is there were the operations that went on that
13 were the sources of contamination.

14 One was a filling of a depression ravine
15 and the other was an area of historic earth works to the
16 south side where the Army actually operated some sort of
17 metal salvage operation.

18 So the contamination is generally shallow
19 associated with surface work, and there's been no
20 identification of debris fill in that area. The surface
21 contamination was on the top.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I see. Thank you.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: You can imagine that they
24 were bringing trucks and dumping them off a hillside into
25 an area where they were storing, however recycling

1 occurred.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you. I just
3 didn't know about that name.

4 Any other questions about the update?

5 MS. FANELLI: I didn't mention about the
6 lake, so that is a large one. And Genevieve is the
7 project manager on our side as Medi is on the DTSC side,
8 and I know they are working on a schedule to do some
9 additional outreach with constituents and neighbors, the
10 Friends of Mountain Lake in particular, as well as the
11 RAB.

12 So I think you should be hearing some news
13 in terms of that schedule, that plan soon.

14 We are still looking at trying to have some
15 outreach and communication. DTSC led in the May/June/
16 July time frame with a hope that we would have a RAP
17 document ready sometime in the end of August/September
18 time frame that would actually go out for public
19 comments.

20 After that, we'll close them and go to
21 design, probably in the 2012 time frame with 2013 as our
22 target date of doing the actual work.

23 So that is a big effort that is getting up
24 and trying to get a robust schedule that really clearly
25 outlines the outreach and the communications associated

1 with that work.

2 MS. BLUM: Eileen, I noticed a good deal
3 of correspondence on the site 1065, and I thought right
4 up until this past week it was completely cleaned up. I
5 don't know why. I thought it was closed.

6 MS. FANELLI: It was finished, but it
7 wasn't closed. Agnes reviewed our closure submittals and
8 had some questions.

9 So we went back and we addressed her
10 questions, and that was the primary person for the
11 revised closure submittal.

12 At the same time, because Agnes has been so
13 good about closing tanks, we decided to be a little more
14 complete.

15 There were several tanks associated with
16 the 1065 site, and so we thought it would be valuable in
17 the closure document to identify them individually and
18 make sure all the historical documents associated with
19 the pull of that tank or the closure of that DTSC
20 statement is articulated clearly.

21 Our real motivations for that is to make
22 sure that it was very clear to Zurich when we come off of
23 our RSL list. So we took a little bit more thorough
24 approach.

25 So in addition to responding to some

1 comments on groundwater particular, our analysis of the
2 arsenic in groundwater, we made some tables that clearly
3 document all the tanks that were activities that were
4 closed as part of that site.

5 MS. BLUM: If my memory serves me, this is
6 supposed to be the water recycling plant for the water
7 reuse plant for the trust.

8 MS. FANELLI: It's still -- to my
9 knowledge, it is still the primary location, proposed
10 location for that plant. That plant is currently not
11 funded.

12 MS. BLUM: It's not funded.

13 MS. FANELLI: It's not funded, so I'm not
14 sure what its schedule is. I would have to get more
15 information and get back to you.

16 MS. BLUM: Yes. If you wouldn't mind.

17 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

18 MS. BLUM: Because I think that that plant
19 if I recall is supposed to be up and running by now.
20 Yeah, it would be good to know.

21 MR. BERMAN: The Baker Beach 2, were there
22 any new problems?

23 MS. FANELLI: I don't think any new
24 problems were discovered. Our review of the data seems
25 to indicate that we only have a few samples of the actual

1 debris. There's samples around the debris and some in
2 the debris, but not enough in the debris to characterize
3 it.

4 We propose some better sample activities,
5 try to characterize it, try to delineate some of the
6 edges.

7 We're proposing the same type of sampling
8 in the metal salvage recycling area to make sure that we
9 capture the limits of that activity and identify it.

10 MR. BERMAN: So you do know roughly what
11 the depth of the debris is, the waste? I mean, is there
12 some information about it?

13 MS. FANELLI: There is an estimate of
14 that. That's one of the concerns is before we begin an
15 excavation, because of the -- exponential is too strong a
16 word, but the significant growth of the debris fills in
17 the Baker Beach 1A site, there's some concern of what
18 we're going to be excavating.

19 MR. BERMAN: So there's really not a firm
20 cost estimate, then, associated with that?

21 MS. FANELLI: We have not updated that
22 cost estimate, and I imagine we will update it once we
23 take these additional sample points.

24 But yes, that cost will change based upon
25 what we know at that point.

1 MR. BERMAN: It will be interesting if it
2 turns out to be a Baker Beach 1 phenomenon.

3 MS. FANELLI: Interesting is one way to
4 describe it. We don't want surprises.

5 I don't think it's the volume so much.
6 It's being able to state with some confidence what we're
7 getting into so that there isn't unexpected growth, which
8 is I think the reaction of at least the trust management
9 to that, the growth of Baker Beach 1A, that was
10 problematic because it wasn't expected.

11 MR. BERMAN: Okay. I'm taking your words
12 and writing them down.

13 MS. FANELLI: Are you?

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much.

15 MS. FANELLI: Him, too, so is Mark.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much for
17 your update.

18 Any other questions?

19 We should move along to our comment letter.
20 We have been sending this around a little bit. There
21 were -- there just have been additional comments right up
22 until the meeting and trying to incorporate as many as we
23 can. We'll do the best we can tonight.

24 My hope would be we might be able to get a
25 vote, but if we are not successful, we'll figure out what

1 we're going to do.

2 I do have proxy votes for the some others
3 who are not here, so I do think we have a quorum to
4 actually vote on this.

5 MR. BERMAN: Do you want us to read this
6 now and get the regulatory agency status and let them go?

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I think we -- well,
8 that's a good question. While it's being passed out, I
9 could ask Agnes, do you have anything tonight?

10 MS. FARRES: Do I have an update? Well,
11 just some -- let's see. There's not a whole lot going
12 on. I guess you should know that I'm pregnant, and so
13 I'll be going on maternity leave, so I won't be coming
14 around during August.

15 And we haven't really figured out yet if
16 someone will take my place in the meantime. I'm not sure
17 how long I'll be gone. So I'll have more update on that.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Congratulations.

19 MS. FARRES: Thanks.

20 Is it still going around?

21 MR. BERMAN: I have them here.

22 MS. FANELLI: I know I'll see the final
23 product when you vote on it.

24 Would you prefer that I leave?

25 FACILITATOR KERN: No.

1 MS. FANELLI: Just let me know.

2 MR. BERMAN: I just want to ask Brian a
3 quick question.

4 What's your feeling about the GRH process,
5 of your knowledge of the remediation technology?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not very familiar
7 with that technology. I haven't been involved before.

8 I mean, we expressed concerns early on in
9 the trust making sure that there were adequate
10 precautions should any effect be residual that might
11 migrate to the marsh, and the trust said they'd do
12 temperature monitoring, and we'd be looking for that just
13 to make sure the system is protected.

14 MR. BERMAN: What's the maximum current in
15 the reach?

16 MR. BECK: Electrical current?

17 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

18 MR. BECK: We will use about 800 amps.
19 800 amps.

20 MR. BERMAN: Maximum?

21 MR. BECK: Yeah. That's the power need
22 that we have.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Are you waiting for a
24 motion?

25 FACILITATOR KERN: I just thought I'd give

1 people a chance to look at it.

2 I do know that late last night, I got some
3 comments. I didn't really get them from later today to
4 really have a chance to thread the needle between Sam and
5 other folks.

6 This is what we have at the moment, so I'm
7 anticipating maybe Sam, do you have any comments?
8 Without putting you on the spot.

9 MR. BERMAN: Well, I put a lot of those
10 caveats in what I sent around is there are a lot of
11 assertions in this document and there are no references
12 and the assertions in my opinion are reasonable, but they
13 are opinions, unless they're referenced in some way.

14 And so I am just concerned about the
15 credibility of the document with assertions without -- I
16 mean, someone could look at the document and say there
17 are a lot of assertions here without foundation.

18 They may actually be correct and which we
19 believe to be the case, but the question is -- the
20 question is really what is the -- what is the political
21 environment that this letter is supposed to swim in? And
22 is it supposed to have technical content?

23 There's a lot of technical issues here, but
24 there's no -- there's no what I would call support, and
25 although I think they're all reasonable, I think at this

1 moment here that they look to me like reasonable
2 statements, but they are -- they are asserted here in a
3 way which -- which I feel is -- I'm just stating my
4 opinion. This is one person's opinion. Assertions
5 without backup can be dismissed as without foundation.

6 So the question is: Does that hurt your
7 position? I mean, people are entitled to opinions.
8 We're -- as community members, reading the report,
9 getting information from the trust and the contractors,
10 we can state an opinion, but to state technical facts, we
11 can also state them if we have a reference or we have
12 reasons -- if we can point to some documentation that
13 supports it, or it may already be in the -- the RAP
14 itself. There's pieces in the RAP that state things that
15 support what we say.

16 So the reason I sent what I sent around was
17 I -- not that I disagree with this, but I'm trying to
18 establish what the political environment is for sending
19 out a letter like this which has a lot of assertions, all
20 of which I think are reasonable, but there's no --
21 there's no documentation, there's no reference.

22 So I could be totally off-base because I've
23 made an assumption about the meeting of this, in which
24 case I apologize.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, there's -- I

1 don't think there's any need for apologies. We're all
2 here trying to do our best.

3 So would it be better for you if -- I'm
4 just trying to see where you are on this -- if we had,
5 say, footnotes that reference a document or meeting notes
6 or something like that? Would that make it better?

7 MR. BERMAN: Well, I think it depends on
8 the statements. I mean -- and maybe that's all not
9 necessary. Maybe my approach of this is just not in
10 keeping with what the message is supposed to be.

11 I mean, in paragraph two, it starts off by
12 saying -- in the middle, it says: "Material may contain
13 contamination or invasive species."

14 Is that a statement without foundation or
15 do we have something behind that?

16 I mean, that's the kind of thing that
17 worries me when I see a document like that, and what I
18 wrote was -- and I apologize to the trust if I did not
19 understand correctly, but I didn't see any information in
20 the FS that -- that answered that question was there --
21 was there any contamination or invasive species.

22 So what I wrote was "we haven't seen any
23 documentation that says that this material is clean or
24 how we will be assured to do that."

25 That's what I wrote, but now it says in

1 here "it may contain." The question is if you're trying
2 to provoke somebody, this is a very good letter. This is
3 actually very provocative, but if you really want to make
4 it look like you have something to stand on, you know --
5 I mean, you know, you can go out and swear at people.
6 That's provocative, too, but it may not accomplish your
7 goals.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate that. I
9 think over the years, it hasn't been our intention to
10 provoke, but to provide advice. So --

11 MR. BERMAN: I know John will disagree
12 with my position, I think. I'm not -- I'm stuck in this
13 opinion, and when I understand better what the purpose of
14 this is, maybe that will alleviate some concerns.

15 And then there's other things in there. On
16 page 2, there's -- it shouldn't really have a -- the end
17 of page 1 should have some sentence in here explaining
18 what's coming next. Sort of in terms of writing, it
19 doesn't connect for me.

20 But there's a couple of statements there
21 that -- that seem very reasonable, but are they opinions
22 or do we have evidence?

23 Again, I'm coming from a -- from the point
24 of view of trying to figure out what you want to
25 accomplish by this letter. And so -- and that's why I

1 insist on an apology because I'm doing that by making a
2 grand assumption that the letter is supposed to be
3 factual and in some sense bring evidence to the fore
4 which says that the proposed remedy has something.

5 That's what I'm looking at. Here's a
6 document that has community members that may be concerned
7 there's pitfalls. Here's some of the pitfalls that we
8 think may occur, but we don't know what these are.

9 So in some sense, these are concerns, our
10 opinions, but maybe they are -- maybe it's because I
11 don't have all the information.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the things that
13 I have found over the years is -- and you're bringing
14 good attention to it -- is if we make a detailed page by
15 page comment letters that gets into the nitty gritty,
16 factual, has details that RAB members, it's way too
17 detailed.

18 So I get the kickback this is not something
19 that I would even understand, let alone be able to agree
20 to.

21 So this letter is really intended to be
22 more of a broad strokes try to get at the general ideas,
23 but it sounds like it could be too general for your
24 taste.

25 MR. BERMAN: Well --

1 FACILITATOR KERN: There might be ways to
2 get more support of this, but the effort was to try to
3 make something --

4 MR. BERMAN: I understand that, but I
5 think it's the verbiage that's used.

6 For instance, page 2, you could say: "From
7 reading the material, we are not convinced that the
8 following issues have been adequately addressed." Then
9 you can go into that.

10 But without explaining, you know -- I mean,
11 we read the material and here's some issues that don't
12 seem to be addressed in the FS, so we -- and then because
13 they're not addressed, we're concerned that the remedy
14 may have pitfalls.

15 So, you know, this is largely where I'm
16 coming from.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm. John.

18 MR. BUDROE: March 23rd to April 22nd.
19 The RAB either agrees with the proposed alternative in
20 here or it doesn't. So we don't have a lot of time to
21 sit and come to a decision.

22 In fact, if the board's going to take any
23 action, there's going to be a vote, this is it.

24 So -- and that's question number one. Do
25 we agree with in general what's in the letter or not.

1 We could probably put together an ad hoc
2 committee or use one of the committees that's already --
3 I don't have a mental list of which ones would fit the
4 bill -- to put together a technical appendix of
5 individual technical comments on a page by page basis in
6 the document, and that might fit the bill for what Sam's
7 talking about.

8 MR. BERMAN: I don't think that's what I'm
9 talking about at all.

10 MR. BUDROE: Well, that's kind of what I
11 was hearing. We have to have a factual basis for making
12 your assertion.

13 Well, the technical document, technical
14 appendix is a factual basis or could be made into one,
15 but the fact is we either decide that we like the
16 proposed alternative or we don't or we do nothing, in
17 which case it's the default to status quo.

18 You go with what -- essentially what DTSC
19 has said in their presentation. So that's the question.
20 Do we want to take a position on this or not?

21 MR. BERMAN: Well, Jan.

22 MS. BLUM: Yes, Sam.

23 MR. BERMAN: When two alpha males knock
24 heads, we need you to rescue us.

25 MS. BLUM: I'd like to defer to the other

1 ladies. I've already spoken quite a bit this week.

2 I have my -- I have a letter that I'm
3 writing at home that's from me, but I'm happy to sign
4 this letter. I think in principle, it addresses the
5 issues that I have, and to me, so many times it's a
6 matter of just wordsmithing. I do that to myself.

7 I mean, I could never finish a document if
8 I didn't say that's it, but I'd also like to hear from
9 Julie and Gloria about what they think. Put you guys on
10 the spot.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I'm accustomed to
12 writing comment letters, not just from the RAB that have
13 opinions, and actually, this version does have -- by the
14 way, Sam, your original's right here that you referred
15 to. It does have more of what you want than the previous
16 version does.

17 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm, yes.

18 MS. CHEEVER: It does have appears and we
19 believes here and there, sort of a combination of that.

20 MR. BERMAN: I think you did a very good
21 job of -- you know, of -- of ameliorating the two -- or
22 combining the two into something that is a little more
23 digestible, but what I still -- what bothers me is what I
24 said.

25 I don't think it requires footnotes and

1 things. It just requires that you say these -- I mean,
2 when you read it, just where you're coming from.

3 Do you have -- when you read this and you
4 look at number one and number two on page 2, are these
5 established facts or are these -- are these concerns that
6 don't seem to be answered by the -- by the FS and the
7 RAP?

8 They're not identified in a way that's
9 problematically meaningful of what the intent of the
10 letter is, because let's say you put that in there and
11 then the trust says yes, we agreed or we disagreed or
12 yes, we did not include that in there, but we have an
13 answer for you, and because --

14 MS. BLUM: We're not in a back and forth
15 communication period, though.

16 MR. BERMAN: Right, but --

17 MS. BLUM: So they have to take a stand.

18 MR. BERMAN: But the trust does have to
19 respond to the public comment.

20 MS. BLUM: Right.

21 MR. BERMAN: And so it's just a question
22 of what you expect from them.

23 So anyway, I've said more than I should
24 have and I -- I --

25 MS. BLUM: It's a good debate.

1 MR. BERMAN: I'm trying to make the letter
2 be effective because I'm presuming that the trust will
3 respond to this, and if I was a trust person -- if I put
4 on a trust hat, my blood would be boiling after I read
5 this letter.

6 It's not -- it's not put in a way that
7 says -- there are a lot of assertions there that don't
8 have to be said that way. They just have to be said that
9 we read the material, we've been to the public
10 presentation and these are concerns that were not
11 answered. Okay.

12 MS. BLUM: Can I ask a question?

13 If we, Doug were to substantiate these
14 statement of facts in here that you're having a problem
15 with by invitation, if it's possible in that volume of
16 material, would that satisfy your need for clarity? If
17 he could say page 4, section 6, subtitle A.

18 MR. BERMAN: Are you in a position to do
19 that? I'm certainly not knowledgeable enough to do that.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, you know, I'm --
21 this was an effort for the RAB, and I'm actually going
22 through the process of a page by page writing of a
23 separate comment letter from me, and it will incorporate
24 other data reports and things.

25 So it's just -- I'm happy to substantiate

1 particular points if that's -- that would make you feel
2 better about it. Absolutely. I will.

3 MR. BERMAN: Well, there's a time -- as
4 John says, there's a time issue here, so -- and do you
5 feel that you can substantiate all these, you can say
6 these are our concerns, many of which are -- can be
7 substantiated by factual material not included in this
8 letter?

9 If you want to say that. I mean, I think
10 that's -- because I look at the letter as a stand-alone
11 letter and I put on my RAB hat and then I put on the
12 trust hat and look at it.

13 If I were a trust person reading this
14 letter, maybe not Eileen who's involved with the history,
15 but someone else at the trust reads it and they'd say,
16 "Where do these guys get off saying this?"

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I definitely appreciate
18 what you're saying about the references.

19 MS. GEE: One of the ways maybe to address
20 Sam's concerns, you know, is just like -- just on the
21 bottom of the first page, insert another sentence that
22 would be like drawing -- you know, like you have that one
23 sentence there followed by drawing on our whatever, you
24 might want reference to various reports and meetings of
25 whatever date, we have -- we have the following points

1 to --

2 MR. BERMAN: Concerns, yeah.

3 MS. GEE: That's all you need. You don't
4 have to do an annotation of line and verse on this late
5 date.

6 But all you have to do is incorporate
7 another sentence there, and then that hopefully will
8 cover, you know -- be short enough to cover the subject,
9 but not enough to give you the bibliography of everything
10 that you're drawing on.

11 MS. CHEEVER: But also Sam has said the
12 review of the feasibility studies.

13 MS. GEE: You can just do that in one
14 sentence at the bottom.

15 MS. CHEEVER: But we can read that
16 sentence.

17 MS. GEE: It's like a gloss-over of all
18 the things that contributed to the RAB's findings
19 concerns that are raised in this letter.

20 MR. BERMAN: Right. But then you got the
21 sentence up there in the second paragraph about --
22 stating that the -- that the soils may contain
23 contamination and invasive species.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Speaking for myself, I
25 thought that was so obvious because that's happened so

1 much in other soil. So I don't know -- we could go back
2 to your wording, there was no assurance provided in the
3 trust documentation. If that's the case.

4 MR. BERMAN: That's what I thought by
5 reviewing it.

6 MS. CHEEVER: In this case, it's also
7 experience with other --

8 MR. BERMAN: Right. You make a very good
9 point. You say this has occurred --

10 MS. CHEEVER: Right.

11 MR. BERMAN: You can emphasize -- you can
12 say there's no documentation provided in the trust
13 material and it has occurred in the past. But, you
14 know --

15 MS. CHEEVER: We've identified two full
16 sentences we can add to this, and the question is: Does
17 that take care of your -- would that be enough to take
18 care of your concerns, Sam?

19 MR. BERMAN: Well, I think it goes a long
20 way, because it sort of puts the -- and then there's the
21 last paragraph on page 2 where it discusses -- it says:
22 "Water could also inevitably work."

23 I mean, the question is -- is that an
24 opinion or is that based on some past experience?

25 MS. GEE: Sam, are you having problems

1 with "inevitably"? Maybe that could be just removed and
2 say: "Water could also work through the base." You're
3 not saying that you know -- we're omnipotent.

4 MR. BERMAN: We could say it's possible.
5 It's possible that that -- unless you give a reference.
6 You know, when you -- I'm just trying to make the
7 document look a little bit more professional without --
8 assertions without footnotes or references.

9 And so there's just a few words here and
10 there that keep the material in an expression of concerns
11 and discussing, you know, possibilities.

12 So --

13 MS. CHEEVER: So now we have three places
14 where we would change it.

15 MR. BERMAN: Right.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Is there any one that just
17 jumps out at you?

18 MR. BERMAN: Well, there's a sentence in
19 the fourth paragraph of page 2 that says: "We are asked
20 to agree with a plan." I just want to understand what
21 that means.

22 Are we formally asked? We don't have to
23 say anything; right? The RAB can just sit there and
24 listen.

25 Have we been asked?

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate that
2 comment, Sam. Obviously it's an expression, and your
3 interpretation is more of a literal one. So we could
4 work on that.

5 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Okay.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: It's not a problem.
7 Not a problem at all.

8 MR. BERMAN: I think most of what I'm
9 saying is pretty minor, but it goes towards giving the
10 decorum of the letter and in my opinion a more
11 professional status, less assertive without
12 documentation, an expression of the concern of the
13 community members.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I take your point. I
15 really do. I'm just -- I'm running out of time. I have
16 five minutes left in the meeting.

17 MR. BERMAN: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: What I'd like to know,
19 though, is what can we do tonight that -- given your
20 concerns, would you be prepared to agree to the letter in
21 principle with a sentence of your -- the modifications
22 that you've asking for?

23 I really don't have a problem taking the
24 time to -- you know, to do the wordsmithing.

25 MR. BERMAN: Right. There's basically

1 four places. There's paragraph -- the second paragraph
2 where it deals with the materials. There's the
3 introductory sentence that's required by you go to points
4 one and two on page 2. There's dealing with we are asked
5 to agree --

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

7 MR. BERMAN: -- and to modify the last
8 paragraph on page 2 so that it is less of an assertion
9 and more of a -- a statement of concern.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Possibility.

11 MR. BERMAN: Possibility.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

13 MS. BLUM: Based on those changes, I would
14 like to make a motion that we accept the letter in
15 principle and we submit it.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Presumably you'd want
17 to be able to review it?

18 MS. BLUM: One more time.

19 Does that mean you'll continue
20 wordsmithing?

21 MR. BERMAN: No. I think Doug should say
22 this is the final thing and either vote yes or no so that
23 John is satisfied that we're not getting out of the time
24 zone.

25 MR. BUDROE: Do it within the time or it

1 doesn't exist.

2 MR. BERMAN: I think Doug could send
3 around -- there's a motion on the floor, so we're in a
4 discussion.

5 The discussion is about the motion, and
6 then in the discussion we're saying Doug is going to
7 modify the letter to include these four things and send
8 it around I guess with a date by saying if he doesn't
9 hear back from everybody -- everyone at this table, we're
10 assuming that we voted yes.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Since there was a
12 second -- a discussion, let me just get a second.

13 MR. BUDROE: Second.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. We'll
15 incorporate that discussion. I'm happy to do as has been
16 laid out in that motion, review those four things, pass
17 the letter around again.

18 Is there any further discussion on the
19 letter?

20 MR. BERMAN: Mark has been quiet all
21 evening long.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm fine with that.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. All in
24 favor of the motion as stated, which is -- I'm -- the
25 letter is agreed to in principle with those four

1 modifications and it being sent out, all in favor, say
2 aye?

3 (All voted aye).

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Opposed? The motion
5 carries.

6 That should include four proxy votes from
7 Jan Monaghan, Tony Kramer, John Chester, which I actually
8 got during the meeting and Barbara Newton, and I would
9 also like to say that we received a very nice note from
10 Jim Ketcham. Hopefully everybody had a chance to read
11 that.

12 He expressed his concerns about deviating
13 from the proposed remedy on the basis of time. The time,
14 he's very concerned about the kids being able to play on
15 the fields. He's concerned about the shortage of fields,
16 and we respect his views and appreciate his participation
17 of these many months.

18 So I did want to note that that was his
19 concern, and he was concerned that his views wouldn't
20 necessarily be taken in, but I think we've all considered
21 them and appreciate them very much.

22 All right. And we'll do that work as
23 requested and get that back to you as soon as I can.
24 Thank you very much for your patience with that item.

25 We've covered item number 5.

1 Is there any new business? Any public
2 comment?

3 MS. CHEEVER: You know, on the agenda
4 under Regulatory Comment, it doesn't list the Park
5 Service.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're not a regulatory
7 agency.

8 MS. CHEEVER: You're not? Okay. Do you
9 have any comment?

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: No.

11 MR. BERMAN: Anyway --

12 FACILITATOR KERN: The action items are
13 clear. We've got to work on the letter some more.

14 Anything before we close?

15 MR. BERMAN: Is there an agenda for the
16 monthly meeting?

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not yet.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: No. The next meeting
19 will be after the comment period is over. We'll have to
20 talk about if there's any need to do that.

21 MS. FANELLI: I had mentioned earlier in a
22 previous meeting that we wanted to come in and show you
23 and share some of the design of landfill E that the trust
24 is considering.

25 So the May meeting might be good for that.

1 You might put it in the context of answering questions.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: The next being RAB
3 meeting or the committee meeting?

4 MS. FANELLI: Next being a RAB meeting.
5 I'm suggesting that.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: The May meeting.

7 MS. FANELLI: May. Sorry.

8 MR. BERMAN: I'm sorry. The May RAB
9 meeting or the committee meeting.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: The May RAB meeting.

11 MS. FANELLI: I meant to say May. The May
12 RAB meeting is where I thought we could present that.

13 I should have the revised final grading
14 plans for fillsite 1, landfill 2 by your next planning
15 meeting. I can certainly share that information with you
16 if you'd like to see that.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I think that would be
18 very nice.

19 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

20 MS. BLUM: Can you do some computer
21 generated mock-ups for us non-geological types? Just
22 kind of show the --

23 MS. FANELLI: I can see. It's a skill set
24 that the people that are doing the design don't usually
25 have. It would be the landscape architect that can take

1 that topography. I can see if we can give a perspective.

2 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. We have
4 potential agenda items for our next committee meeting and
5 next RAB meeting.

6 I'd like to thank Mike again for your being
7 here. Thank you, Eileen, for getting Mike here and for
8 that informative discussion on the treatment.

9 Anything else before we close?

10 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

11 Thanks, everyone, for coming out.

12 (The meeting concluded at 9:05 PM).

13 ---o0o---

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator
Mark Youngkin
4 Eileen Fanelli
Brian Ullensvang
5 Julie Cheever
John Chester
6 Jan Blum
Jan Monaghan
7 Toni Kramer
Jim Ketcham
8 John Budroe
Edward Callanan

9 Special Guests:

10 Chris Hunt
11 Connie Gazaway
Dillon Morra
12 Shannon Wright

13 ---o0o---

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on May 10, 2011, 7:09 PM at the
17 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
18 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
19 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
20 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements - None	
6	4) Discussion & Presentations:	
7	A. Landfill 2, Fillsite 1 design	4
8	B. Landfill E design	34
9	Presentation by Dillon Morra	4
10	Presentation by Chris Hunt	35
11	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
12	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
13	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - Not present	
14	6) New Business - None	
15	7) Public Comment - None	
16	8) Action Items & Agenda Items:	67
17	9) Adjournment:	71
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone.
2 Welcome to the regular meeting of the Presidio
3 Restoration Advisory Board. It's lonely on this side of
4 the table, but you guys are closer than normal, so that
5 makes it nice.

6 I'd like to welcome the Trust and the
7 contractors, our regulatory community, who are not here
8 for various reasons that we know about, and community
9 members of the RAB, thank you for being here tonight.

10 Are there any changes, additions to our
11 agenda?

12 Any announcements?

13 Very well. Moving on to item 4, we have
14 landfill 2, fillsite 1 design.

15 MS. FANELLI: So I'm going to introduce
16 Dillon Morra with Kennedy/Jenks. He's the designer on
17 fillsite 1, landfill 2 and we thought it would be great
18 to review the final grading plans and give you a picture
19 of that.

20 You might have noticed. They are starting
21 to do the second season of grading.

22 MR. MORRA: As Eileen said, I'm Dillon
23 Morra with Kennedy/Jenks. I'm a civil engineer. I like
24 to draw a lot of black lines on white paper, so I
25 apologize for the lack of color, but I hope to

1 communicate what's been planned for the site.

2 You're probably familiar with this
3 information. The remediation group hired Kennedy/Jenks
4 to design the activation and reconstruction of fillsite 1
5 and landfill 2, and so I only have two slides. There's
6 some photos. You may or may not have seen the site as it
7 exists today.

8 So first I'll talk about fillsite 1. It's
9 relatively simple compared to landfill 2.

10 Today, this is -- this is what the grading
11 looks like on the left, and you will see that there's an
12 abrupt toe at the slope, and there's a channel through
13 the center.

14 So the redesign was centered around
15 regrading the site to get rid of that toe and to include
16 a trail, an access route that's up above on this side and
17 remove that channel.

18 So if I can go back to this plan here, this
19 is the trail that will be in kind of the foreground of
20 that first photograph. This is the toe of the slope that
21 will be regraded back.

22 This channel that goes down the center
23 that's required to pass the flows from up above will
24 be -- will be regraded. The rock will be removed. It
25 will be regraded to be more of a depression than a

1 channel.

2 And in that channel, there are a series of
3 check-downs. The water through here can reach pretty
4 good velocity that will erode the slopes if these are not
5 in place. So these are included in here.

6 There are a couple more drainage features.
7 This one in particular is a below grade structure. Two
8 pipes bring flow from up above into a catch basin that
9 goes underneath what you know as the Mountain Lake Trail.

10 There's a trail that will drain this
11 temporary parking area, and I think those are the only
12 drainage that are on fillsite 1.

13 So that's what's planned for fillsite 1.
14 There will be some grading here to accommodate the
15 trails.

16 MS. FANELLI: I should point out, Dillon,
17 we are going to -- it's the Trust's intention to
18 reestablish the temporary parking area right down to Paul
19 Goode Field.

20 So I know I had a question on that from Jim
21 Ketcham, and in the future, we should have an informal
22 parking area like there was before.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Where's the road that goes
24 around? Is that road going to be gone?

25 MR. MORRA: The road that cuts through the

1 center now?

2 MS. GAZAWAY: There's a road that comes
3 that way.

4 MS. BLUM: I think she's talking about the
5 pedestrian walkway.

6 MS. GAZAWAY: That's a separate project
7 that's down below our project.

8 MR. MORRA: This is El Polin here. So
9 this trail will provide access from that area up to
10 Mountain Lake Trail.

11 Are there any other -- feel free to stop me
12 at any time.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks. On fillsite 1,
14 I know there was a lot of material imported on the top
15 and there were some issues around native sands and things
16 of that nature.

17 Is that being adjusted in the final grade?

18 MR. MORRA: Yes, it is, and we worked with
19 Resources to try to get some of those grades,
20 particularly in this area. We're somewhat limited by
21 this trail. It's so far back, and we're somewhat limited
22 by the fact that you start to grade this back.

23 That means you have to grade this back.
24 That scrapes too much of the soil that we want in this
25 area. So it was optimized, but in the end, the area was

1 relatively small.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: Did that answer your
4 question?

5 FACILITATOR KERN: It is.

6 MS. GAZAWAY: We put it where we could.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: And I guess it's hard
8 to respond, but there -- this being a national park, I
9 mean, that was one of the principle goals to the cleanup
10 was to be able to have native plants, things of that
11 nature.

12 So I appreciate your attempts to uncover as
13 much of that as you can.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: We can talk about the
15 grading plans after Dillon -- the planting plans after
16 Dillon goes through the grading plans.

17 MR. MORRA: We did three studies on how to
18 try to get this down to native grade. We can talk about
19 it later.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: The good news is that soil
21 that is native to the Presidio is not in the fill.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm aware of that.

23 MR. MORRA: Are there any other questions?

24 MS. BLUM: Would you perhaps have another
25 picture that might show what that channel would look like

1 in finished form? Because just from here, it looks like
2 a good sea run. It's pretty straight without much grace
3 to it.

4 MR. MORRA: Yeah.

5 MS. BLUM: I'm wondering if you have
6 another picture to show us.

7 MR. MORRA: I don't. I can describe it as
8 being six feet wide and about six inches deep. So I'm
9 about six feet tall and it will be about that deep. It
10 won't be very --

11 MS. BLUM: Will it meander a little bit?

12 MR. MORRA: From what you see here, it
13 does.

14 MS. FANELLI: It really only flows when
15 it's draining. It's to capture the storm water runoff
16 from Julius Kahn. That all comes now to a point source.

17 The trust has overall plans to look at
18 overall storm water management, and they may be --
19 reconnect or reconfigure that drainage in the future, but
20 until that time, we've got to be able to get it safely
21 through fillsite 1.

22 I can give you an image of what this might
23 look like. We used the landfill 10 northern stream
24 channel as our model. It's the same concept. We have
25 the flat, wide swale with perpendicular horizontal cutoff

1 trenches so that you could stop the flows going down.

2 So you won't on the ground surface see
3 these rock channels that Dillon shows on the -- you'll
4 basically just see a swale with a low point.

5 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's important to
6 note, too, that it is vegetated. You essentially will
7 see more or less a grass area out there with the
8 depression so you're not seeing like a pronounced
9 depression.

10 MS. GAZAWAY: It's to eliminate the
11 concentrated flow channel.

12 MS. BLUM: Right.

13 MS. SEGAL: You called them dams earlier.

14 MR. MORRA: They're designed to capture
15 some of the flow and help it to percolate into the ground
16 and also to work as what's referred to as a check dam so
17 that --

18 MS. SEGAL: Are they above the six inch
19 depth, then?

20 MS. FANELLI: It's all subgrade.

21 MS. GAZAWAY: It's buried and cutoff.

22 MR. MORRA: Very important.

23 MR. WRIGHT: If a storm were to start,
24 they will cut off the erosion.

25 MR. MORRA: I should point out that this

1 channel that you see out there today is four feet wide
2 and it has a lot of visible rock. This will be six feet
3 wide, but there will be no visible rock. It will be.

4 MS. SEGAL: Thank you.

5 MR. MORRA: As Jan pointed out and erosion
6 control measure on top of it.

7 MS. SEGAL: Thank you.

8 MR. MORRA: Okay. I'll move on to
9 landfill 2, which is a little more -- a little more
10 in-depth.

11 Grading-wise, what's happening out there is
12 there are the existing terraces in this portion, in the
13 southeastern portion -- southwestern portion that you --
14 I'm sure you've seen out there.

15 And so the goal here is to -- to bury the
16 existing terraces after they were installed and install
17 the remaining terraces that were planned and also bury
18 those.

19 So there will be no surface expression of
20 the walls, but they will still work to stabilize the
21 slope.

22 The slopes in landfill 2, we had a lot of
23 constraints, not only with geotechnical constraints and
24 hydrological constraints, but also a space. There's only
25 so much space to -- to mitigate erosion by grading.

1 Ultimately that's what you want to do,
2 because it's -- it requires less infrastructure, but
3 these walls will not be visible and they'll still serve
4 to keep the slope in place, which was the main objective.

5 MS. KRAMER: So are you adding sand or
6 soil or are you how burying those?

7 MR. MORRA: It's colma soil, I believe,
8 being imported on put on top.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Which is predominantly a
10 sandy soil.

11 MS. KRAMER: Right.

12 MR. MORRA: It will be well drained.
13 We're planning to remove the organic soil that's
14 currently in the terraces and then fill it with that
15 competent material.

16 MS. FANELLI: We're going to be adding
17 some drains. Originally we debated whether or not to put
18 drainage like you do behind a terraced wall and we chose
19 not to last season and we observed this season that those
20 terraced walls trap water maybe more than we want.

21 So we are going to be adding that drainage
22 as part of that second season behind -- not all, but
23 several of the walls in particular where we've noticed
24 water being trapped, and that water that's in that
25 terraced wall will be directed to the new creek channel.

1 So that the site will drain properly.

2 MR. MORRA: That leads us to our -- kind
3 of the central feature here is this channel that passes
4 flow; not only from rainwater falling on this area, but
5 also from water coming down from above.

6 It carries it down into this sedimentation
7 basin that we'll get to in a minute.

8 The drainage features for -- for this site,
9 I should also mention that some of these drainage
10 features are designed as a temporary measure till the
11 slopes become stable and fully vegetated.

12 One of those -- one such feature is this
13 drainage swale here. What this does is it's again a very
14 shallow swale that captures rainwater or surface water
15 from this portion above, diverts it into this pipe and
16 brings it down to this dissipation pool, which is
17 anchored with rock down there. So that takes care of
18 this flow.

19 Flow coming from here will be brought
20 through this culvert, brought through this channel and
21 down into the same basin and flows from here are
22 brought -- some from surface, some from this pipe.

23 This pipe, this pipe are considered
24 temporary measures. The permanent feature would be this
25 channel with concrete retaining wall here at the crossing

1 between the channel and Mountain Lake Trail.

2 There will be some grading, very, very
3 minor grading in this stretch to -- to keep Mountain Lake
4 Trail in. It will be brought across here and reconnected
5 with Cory Trail over here.

6 As Eileen pointed out, there's a water
7 being trapped between these walls, so the subdrain and
8 swales are going to help pass that flow through the pipe
9 and fight through it.

10 Are there any questions on landfill 2?

11 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate all the
12 work that's gone into the design, and it appears somewhat
13 adaptive management as you've discovered some changes.

14 I'm just going to react a little bit off
15 the top of my head, and I'm just commenting, so I
16 don't -- I'm not -- what occurs to me is with adaptive
17 management of these terraces, I'm wondering if we could
18 have done the same thing without the terraces.

19 Notice where there were, you know, drainage
20 areas beginning to form and then do something more
21 naturally based in those areas, whether it was root
22 blots, rock, something that was really designed to be
23 natural given that it's a national park.

24 I'm also just going to react a bit to
25 burying the terraces. I'm wondering if you're going to

1 experience erosion through those -- that buried material
2 and uncovering these terraces.

3 I mean, it just seems like we're going to
4 adapt and adapt, but I'm just responding right off the
5 top of my head.

6 MR. MORRA: Well, to address your first
7 response, ultimately, like I said, you want to grade.
8 Certainly you want surface drainage. You want sheet flow
9 onsite. That's ultimately the most natural. That's how
10 it occurs in nature. So you want the sheet flows.

11 We are very constrained at the site in
12 plants, so it limits all the way around the site, and
13 there's a large elevation drop from top to bottom that
14 you have to deal with, and so the retaining walls are
15 where the aesthetics and the engineering meet.

16 There were other alternatives considered,
17 and there will be some maintenance issues with -- with
18 this until the -- the slope is stabilized, very minor
19 milling, things like that, but nothing compared to
20 sloughing off the slopes that you would see without
21 retaining walls.

22 And --

23 MS. FANELLI: What that is really is
24 having native materials which are standing on a steep
25 slope and you can't really compact them to a point where

1 you can have them stable without doing some other type of
2 reinforcement.

3 So the compromise that was made here in
4 consultation with Natural Resources is that they value
5 those native looser sands placed loosely, and so in order
6 to retain those looser sands in place, we had to have
7 something like this to hold it or else we would have had
8 to bring in some other type of material that could have
9 been compacted and had a greater cohesive strength to
10 resist the erosive effects of surface water runoff.

11 Even with this modification of burying
12 these things, we're -- when we talk about revegetation,
13 we are going to plant it quite heavily and we're going to
14 seed the entire site, and for the -- for the first season
15 because we want to get as many groups in place as we can
16 to hold those stands in place.

17 MS. GAZAWAY: The idea -- giving the
18 terrace retains the sand, but it retains the water, too.

19 I think to your point, we have so much
20 water and so much sand out there, that we do have a
21 channel where you can put this kind of more biological
22 treatments in was difficult or challenging in this
23 location, and what we did do is we have cedar -- it's not
24 fresh treated.

25 So the idea is they will rot out below the

1 surface without the kind of vegetation takes hold.
2 That's what our plan is. We thought this was a better
3 compromise than putting in rock or some other kind of
4 permanent structure.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

6 MS. GAZAWAY: These will be temporary
7 until they start to deteriorate and the vegetation has
8 taken hold. So we've kind of built that into the plan as
9 well just to retain the soil.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you for those
11 explanations. I'm definitely not trying to have you
12 defend your --

13 MS. GAZAWAY: It's a challenge.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just responding in
15 a way that we all want a kind of a -- I mean,
16 historically there was kind of a channel through here.

17 MR. MORRA: Mm-hmm.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: So maybe there will be
19 again some day, you know. Nature battles last.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: Our channel that has been
21 located, we tried to approximate the location of the
22 historic channel.

23 This one is going to be more of a natural
24 stream channel. We're going to be working with
25 consultants that specialize in -- contractors who

1 specialize in that.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: With -- is there a
3 consideration of maybe installing what's been done in
4 other areas around the Presidio, willow stakes and all
5 that?

6 MS. GAZAWAY: Mm-hmm.

7 MR. MORRA: I can show you some plans with
8 willow stakes.

9 MS. FANELLI: There's two sets of
10 drawings. These are the grading plans, basically, and
11 they have -- included in there are some basic soil
12 treatments.

13 So we've had H.D. Harvey working with
14 Kennedy/Jenks and they've identified where we need
15 composites and they will broadcast the seed.

16 Primarily sterile weed will work. In some
17 areas I believe we'll mix in sterile weed with natural
18 grass seed that the Natural Resources has propagated and
19 get all those in place.

20 On the tail of that, maybe a couple months
21 after that, then we will come in with a company that
22 actually plants -- so trees will be planted and the
23 native plants will be planted in different areas.

24 That planting palate plan is not finalized,
25 I don't believe.

1 MS. GAZAWAY: Hopefully at the end of the
2 summer.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: I had one other
4 question, but I didn't want to -- I want to give others a
5 chance.

6 Another thing that comes to mind from this
7 photo down in this area, there's kind of a marshland and
8 there's also retention basin that's been in there.

9 That was another point of -- do we hope
10 that that will change? Because that's not really a
11 natural feature, but we also -- there's a wetlands in
12 there and that seems pretty important, so how that will
13 be treated, affected by these designs?

14 MR. MORRA: Just as kind of a sidebar, we
15 all want this site to be in a quote natural state.
16 Philip Williams & Associates who designed this channel,
17 Mr. Phillips has a wonderful article online that I urge
18 you to read.

19 He talks about this kind of interim
20 situation where we want to return salt marshes. We want
21 to return sites back to their historic natural balance,
22 but we're human and we can't speed that process up.

23 So this is this interim part that's so
24 painful for everybody, and I just want to recognize that
25 and let you ponder on -- on that.

1 It's a relatively short period of time,
2 where geologic time is very, very short. A lot of these
3 measures are interim measures and some will disappear.
4 Some will kind of disappear into the vegetation as time
5 goes on.

6 So this dissipation pond at the bottom, the
7 retention basin at the bottom of landfill 2, which is in
8 this area here, was designed by Philip Williams &
9 Associates, as well.

10 So it has three -- three -- the basin is
11 basically this area, but it has three areas.

12 This first area is what is called an energy
13 dissipation pool. So it has some rock armoring, has some
14 willows, and it helps to dissipate the energy of the
15 water that comes from basically three directions. From
16 this area, from this area and also in this channel.

17 Then the flow is routed around this path
18 that is -- is closely modeled to what the historic
19 channel was. So it meanders around what this does. It
20 slows down the flow.

21 This second area is a sedimentation basin.
22 It takes up all the sediment that comes down from these
23 flows.

24 Then that flow continues on to this
25 detention basin which has a metered flow structure down

1 here that eventually allows the flow to go down into El
2 Polin Loop.

3 There's a berm here that's about a three
4 foot high berm. What this berm does is help to retain or
5 detain, not retain flows from storms. So if there was a
6 25-year storm, there would be some associated with that.
7 That gets held here.

8 So one of the objectives of this project is
9 not to overload the storm system that's down below, and
10 so this detention basin addresses that.

11 This metered flow, the inlet to this
12 structure is at an elevation that maintains some water in
13 this pool that will help wetland to develop, and then
14 over here, we have to -- we have a detention basin, you
15 have to have an emergency overflow.

16 That's what this is, and there's a series
17 of log drops that again take some of the energy out of
18 the flow and it continues on to El Polin.

19 There's whole planting plan for this, as
20 well.

21 MR. KETCHAM: What happens on the eastern
22 side of this area as you move closer and over to the Paul
23 Goode Field here? What's the design there?

24 MR. MORRA: Fillsite 1?

25 MS. FANELLI: You just missed it, Jim.

1 MR. KETCHAM: I don't want to waste
2 people's time if you've done it.

3 MR. MORRA: It's similar. The channel
4 isn't as -- as pronounced, and there's no grading.

5 MS. FANELLI: There's a new trail
6 alignment just slightly different from the one that's
7 there now, and we'll put the temporary parking area back.
8 And you can point to where it is, Dillon on the map.

9 MR. MORRA: This here?

10 MS. FANELLI: The parking area.

11 MR. MORRA: Oh, yes. Here.

12 MS. FANELLI: That's going to be restored
13 as an informal parking area until such time as planning
14 moves forward with the actual improvement to the site.

15 MR. MORRA: Mm-hmm.

16 MR. KETCHAM: Which is not something
17 that's happened yet.

18 MR. MORRA: Yeah. This project doesn't
19 address that.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: We'll be doing it in the
21 final grading, but the improvement to that parking lot
22 and future park, that's a project in the future.

23 MS. FANELLI: And I don't have -- I did
24 not check in with their timing. I know that they are
25 trying to fast-track it along with Pop Hicks. I think

1 they're trying to do Pop Hicks maybe as a higher
2 priority.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: In that temporary
4 parking, are there going to be any considerations made to
5 oil spills, things coming out of cars?

6 I mean, we just cleaned this area up, so --

7 MR. MORRA: There's a filter fabric and
8 there's a -- there's the rock in this area.

9 MS. GAZAWAY: We're going to be paving it,
10 though.

11 MR. MORRA: It won't be paved.

12 MS. FANELLI: It won't be paved, and
13 anything there is will be picked up that won't be used
14 anymore.

15 MS. GAZAWAY: It will be taken into a
16 treatment plant.

17 MR. MORRA: This is on the plans, another
18 temporary parking lot. The design and the grading in
19 this area is meant to fast-track the design.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Sure. Well, I'm just
21 hoping people are considering cars leak and, you know, we
22 just cleaned it up, so we want people to get access to
23 the play fields, but we don't want to pass up the
24 environmental.

25 MS. FANELLI: It's a good point. So we

1 can think about that relative to what we've got planned,
2 the fabric and the rock and whether or not some other
3 measure may be warranted.

4 MR. CHESTER: Just out of curiosity, on
5 your landfill 2, the rate of flow in coming down at the
6 highest point, do you have an estimated cubic feet?

7 MR. MORRA: It's about seven cubic feet
8 per second.

9 MR. CHESTER: That's a max?

10 MR. MORRA: 25-year. I think the max is
11 higher.

12 May I take any other questions about the
13 design? If I can help maybe describe any of these
14 features, what they might look like, what they do.

15 MS. KRAMER: So in terms of the grading
16 for this, is this -- I mean, it seems like the best thing
17 would be to return it to the way it was originally, but
18 you can't do that because you -- there's fill material
19 that wasn't removed; correct?

20 MR. MORRA: That's correct. There's a lot
21 of fill material and there's also dune sand that's
22 migrated over time.

23 MS. GAZAWAY: There's a lot of
24 improvements, too, like tennis courts and things. We
25 struggled with that.

1 MS. KRAMER: You mean at Julius Kahn.

2 MS. GAZAWAY: We'd have to have a twenty
3 foot high concrete retaining wall, and that wouldn't be
4 natural at all.

5 MS. KRAMER: You mean up at the top, so
6 you couldn't just let it find its own grade because of
7 the tennis courts at the top.

8 MS. GAZAWAY: It's too steep.

9 MS. FANELLI: I would argue that that fill
10 is earth fill, so it's not a waste fill by any means.
11 All that has been removed and we have the current from
12 DTSC that the waste from fillsite 1 has been removed.

13 The surface beneath that fill, I'm not sure
14 is a native natural surface. It was historically
15 modified by the occupants of the site who originally
16 built a dam and encountered water behind that dam.

17 So it's not a natural grade. It's native
18 constituent material, but its surface wouldn't be like a
19 buried soil surface necessarily. It had been modified.

20 The same in fillsite -- landfill 2. So
21 it's kind of an interesting discussion as to what the
22 native grade or the historic grade is, because it has
23 been significantly modified.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: And it reminds me of
25 another question about landfill 2. There were some -- in

1 the confirmation sampling some potentially residual
2 contamination there, and the explanation was well, these
3 soils are new buried by the imported fill.

4 I'm wondering if this has been resolved.

5 MS. FANELLI: There's going to be an area.
6 We've been working with Medi. So when we go back and do
7 the wetland grade -- let me correct that.

8 It's not really a wetland. What we're
9 building is a sedimentation pond retention basin with the
10 goal of alternately developing it into a wetland which
11 would supplement with support of our natural resources
12 people so it works.

13 But that grading is going to end up
14 removing that spot. And so we'll probably grab an
15 additional confirmation sample, and I know we'll work
16 with Medi on that.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Actually, tomorrow, we're
18 going to be addressing those areas.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: That's important and
20 really good information. I'm glad to hear that.

21 MS. GAZAWAY: Thank you.

22 MR. MORRA: Any other questions, comments?

23 MS. FANELLI: We have more on landfill E
24 coming up here, just to pace yourselves.

25 MR. MORRA: Well, thank you.

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Landfill 2, the names are
2 silly.

3 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure what Natural
4 Resources's goal is for this. Tennessee Hollow. But we
5 will probably -- it's a good point sooner than later stop
6 using the nomenclature LF 2 and fillsite 1.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I suppose while you're
8 still there, I do have this thinking of with these
9 terraces being buried or the material removed and then
10 other material being put in, it seems that there would be
11 a potential for further adaptive management.

12 What are the plans for kind of keeping
13 people onsite during rainy weather, looking at what's --
14 how it's changing, what you might need to fix?

15 MS. FANELLI: We will do a whole
16 operations maintenance plan for the site and we actually
17 are developing one that we'll submit to Water Board,
18 although we don't have to pull and get a construction
19 permit under the Regional Board order because of CERCLA
20 cleanup.

21 We comply substantially with those
22 requirements, and one of those requirements is a
23 monitoring plan until we get approximately seventy
24 percent, I think is the marker plant growth coverage on
25 this area, or there's other equations that you can use to

1 determine when your site is stable, basically.

2 So we're going to have a monitoring plan
3 that looks at stabilization, and the trust has been using
4 its own forces, but we've also hired ERRG, for example,
5 and graded area 9, landfill 8, landfill 10 and they're
6 probably a similar role on this site until we get
7 vegetation starting to grow.

8 MS. GAZAWAY: Our planting plan is put
9 together based on the type of soil and moisture that we
10 expect based on expectation.

11 We have to develop a site specific, oak
12 scrub in another area.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: I recall from -- when
14 we did landfill 6B, there was a whole interaction.

15 MS. FANELLI: 6A.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm sorry. I get my
17 A's and B's mixed up there. That there was an
18 interaction by the state because it was waters of the
19 state and they wanted to have a say on the -- on the
20 plans.

21 So I'm curious whether or not that will
22 happen.

23 MS. FANELLI: There's no permit required
24 from the state. Our cleanup has -- the cleanup CULs for
25 sediment in freshwater were outlined in the RAP and were

1 used for the channel elements of this site and were --
2 through the comments from the RAP with Water Board and
3 our monitoring plan, that's responding to their concerns.

4 MS. KRAMER: Does anybody either from the
5 Presidio Trust, like in the landscape architecture
6 department, review your plans for not just technical, you
7 know, carrying things through, but for some sort of
8 asthetic compliance with, you know, and/or -- well, you
9 know, sort of an oversight?

10 MR. MORRA: Of course.

11 MS. KRAMER: As opposed to okay. We're
12 taking the water out here. We're, you know, technically
13 Solving these problems, but saying is this aesthetically
14 fit within the -- you know, the goals of the park and
15 the --

16 MS. GAZAWAY: We've --

17 MR. MORRA: Yes.

18 MS. GAZAWAY: -- been working with the
19 planning and specifically the landscape architect since
20 last October.

21 So this is kind of a consensus of all of
22 the groups' input of what was the best treatment for
23 this.

24 MS. KRAMER: So someone does review that
25 part of it.

1 MS. GAZAWAY: Natural Resources.

2 MS. FANELLI: I wouldn't even use the word
3 "review." It's a collaborative effort.

4 MS. GAZAWAY: Design workshops that we've
5 had on a regular basis since October.

6 MS. FANELLI: We make sure that it meets
7 engineering requirements and that it meets remediation
8 goals, but the layout, where these trails are, what the
9 crossings look like are a hundred percent from Trust
10 Planning Department. They're not remediation.

11 MS. KRAMER: And also the grading would --
12 should also.

13 MS. FANELLI: Yeah, it does.

14 MS. GAZAWAY: That's why we've made some
15 of the changes that we have specifically at fillsite 1 to
16 address some of the concerns.

17 MS. KRAMER: It's hard to look at these
18 and understand. Obviously they don't read
19 particularly -- well, you can't see anything.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: They're not renderings that
21 are for the public.

22 MS. KRAMER: They're hard to understand,
23 so you just have to hope that someone else is reviewing
24 them.

25 MR. WRIGHT: We do have meetings out

1 there, actually out in the field. There was discussions
2 about any patterned effect, that the forestry is looking
3 for landscape, landscape group, et cetera. That as has
4 been mentioned is a collaborative effort.

5 MS. GAZAWAY: Cultural Resources has
6 weighed in matching the historic dam. It has been a very
7 collaborative effort.

8 MS. FANELLI: There's multiple opinions on
9 the aesthetics. I can assure you. We're kind of a
10 middle person when it comes to the aesthetics between the
11 different groups within the trust that have different
12 aspirations.

13 MS. KRAMER: And it's just some sort of
14 does it fit.

15 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

16 MS. KRAMER: Will it look natural
17 eventually, you know, or will it just look like an
18 engineering project? So --

19 MS. FANELLI: The goal is to have it look
20 natural. Not only do we collaborate on staff level.
21 There's regular reports that go to both the operations
22 manager and the planning manager, as well, Jeff Deis on
23 the final elements.

24 MS. GAZAWAY: Just, I guess, to point out,
25 too, there will be two terraces that do remain. One

1 being the Mountain Lake Trail connection with Cory Trail,
2 because there has to be a certain width, and it's going
3 to be a multi-use trail, and also up with our cultural
4 feature is.

5 So those are the only two that we, you
6 know -- that will be still visible when we finish the
7 grading on the project.

8 MR. MORRA: I'd be happy to afterwards --
9 if you want to look at a specific detail and I can
10 explain it, I'd be happy to do that.

11 I'm an engineer and I need a lot of help
12 from the other groups in the Presidio to make sure this
13 is aesthetically pleasing, and it's in line with the
14 vegetation master plan that the Presidio has developed.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm sorry to keep you
16 up there. There was this buried tunnel that was
17 discovered.

18 Was there any consideration in the future
19 to uncovering that?

20 MR. MORRA: Yeah.

21 MS. GAZAWAY: A lot of discussion about
22 it.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

24 MS. FANELLI: It would -- it would vastly
25 change the land form. It's about twenty plus feet below

1 grade now.

2 MR. MORRA: 24 feet below the grade here.
3 You would have to grade upwards of -- you know, basically
4 off the map to -- to have the slope stable and to expose
5 it.

6 MS. GAZAWAY: With all the vegetation
7 management and the wetland development.

8 MS. FANELLI: Or you would have very steep
9 retaining walls on either side of a little slot for a
10 drain to run through.

11 That was really one of my comments about
12 what the native landscape was, because that's your native
13 surface, but it's obviously completely modified by man
14 prior to any waste really happening.

15 So returning it to your native soils
16 without any fill on top is in many ways virtually
17 impossible because of how it had been modified in the
18 past.

19 MR. MORRA: Doing migration before all
20 these trees were up on these slopes over here. They were
21 removed.

22 MS. GAZAWAY: But I don't think it's that
23 difficult.

24 MR. MORRA: Okay. I realize you're all
25 volunteers and I appreciate your time and thank you for

1 listening.

2 MS. FANELLI: So Chris Hunt, Chris, you've
3 been here to speak before. You all remember Chris, and
4 he's our designer on landfill E.

5 We have begun the design on landfill E and
6 we have had some informal discussions back and forth with
7 the DTSC on it. And so we'll give you a preview here of
8 where the plans are with that.

9 MS. BLUM: Do you know what's happening
10 with Agnes? I know she's on maternity leave.

11 MS. FANELLI: She's just on vacation. She
12 doesn't go on maternity leave till August.

13 MS. BLUM: I thought she announced she's
14 on maternity leave.

15 MS. FANELLI: Not yet. She's just on
16 another vacation.

17 MS. BLUM: What is she working on?

18 MS. FANELLI: She is working to finish a
19 fair amount of sites on her plate right now that we've
20 submitted, and she may have some interns or help working,
21 but my sense is if she's only gone when she's planning
22 to, six weeks, and she comes back part-time, then some of
23 the stuff may go in slow motion until she's back.

24 I suppose if the trust had a critical issue
25 that we needed, there would be somebody assigned that we

1 could go to. Other than that, I have a feeling we might
2 be waiting a little bit.

3 As far as I can tell, both agencies when
4 there is attrition, there's no backfilling at this point
5 in time. They're not allowed to hire, so we may do as
6 best as we can.

7 Did we lose our light bulb here? I don't
8 have this screwed in.

9 I didn't introduce Shannon Wright. He's
10 our construction manager that's out onsite on a regular
11 basis. He's out at the outer fencing at any of the
12 sites. He's for landfill 1, landfill 2 and landfill E.

13 MR. WRIGHT: If you ever have any
14 discussions when I see me out there.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: What was your name again?

16 MS. FANELLI: Shannon Wright.

17 MR. HUNT: Ready? For those of you who
18 weren't here last time, my name is Chris Hunt. I
19 apologize if I start surrounding raspy. I'm dealing with
20 allergies this week.

21 It will be a whole different presentation
22 and we'll power through.

23 So this is -- just kind of give you a quick
24 overview of the some of the plans that we've put
25 together, a high-level overview of the elements that

1 we've been going through.

2 So that's what we're doing today. We have
3 begun discussions with DTSC on the design and we're
4 anticipating submitting the design reports to them within
5 the next couple weeks, at which point we'll also provide
6 a report to you guys.

7 We're anticipating that there will be two
8 construction seasons. We'll get the bulk of the project
9 done this year and we'll seed the cover and then the
10 formal vegetation will go in a year from now.

11 There is -- every landfill closure project
12 where you have landfill materials remaining in place, you
13 have to have an operations maintenance plan. That is,
14 you are not going to see that in the design part.

15 That is going to be developed -- you know,
16 we know we have to monitor for groundwater. We have to
17 monitor for gas vents.

18 You have to make sure that that cover is
19 working as intended and we don't have a lot of erosion.
20 All those elements will show up. There will be
21 installation of monitoring wells because the existing
22 wells will be taken out as part of -- in advance of
23 construction.

24 So you won't see that operations
25 maintenance plan in the design part. But it will be

1 developed over the course of the -- of the summer.

2 So --

3 MR. CHESTER: Does that mean there will be
4 new groundwater well --

5 MR. HUNT: Yes.

6 MR. CHESTER: -- locations and all new
7 direction as to what's there now?

8 MR. HUNT: It will be -- I mean, it will
9 be similar in terms of locations. We have to be
10 upgrading downgradient of the groundwater flow direction.

11 So -- but we won't be -- there is --
12 there's probably more wells in place than right now than
13 you would need for the long-term monitoring program.

14 So we will work with the regulators on
15 evaluating how many and where.

16 MS. FANELLI: We're destroying the ones
17 that are in the way, basically. We're not going to
18 necessarily destroy them all.

19 If there some that exist that would
20 function in the feature, we would obviously keep those
21 and not redrill them. I don't think any of those details
22 have been worked out yet.

23 MR. CHESTER: Mm-hmm.

24 MR. HUNT: So just a quick overview of one
25 of the things that's going to happen at the start of the

1 project is because we're doing a fairly significant
2 rewrite of the site.

3 The final location of the fence hasn't been
4 set, but we'll be fencing around the property because the
5 contractor's going to be moving -- moving all around the
6 perimeter. It will be a controlled site during the
7 construction.

8 The two primary grading plans that we're
9 dealing with here. The excavation grading plans is
10 actually a combination of excavation and fill.

11 This is where we were going to basically
12 reshape the landfill within the existing landfill
13 footprint, which is -- this dashed blue line here is the
14 landfill footprint, and we're going to excavate in
15 historic forest zone back here.

16 We're going to excavate down to about six
17 feet below final cover so we can get the trees in that
18 area after the area is constructed.

19 In the next sheet, we have below grade, and
20 so within this perimeter, we're excavating and reshaping
21 the landfill to -- to meet those closure grades.

22 The -- let me --

23 MS. FANELLI: Is this the top of the
24 foundation?

25 MR. HUNT: This is top of foundation.

1 MS. FANELLI: Which is a mixture of waste
2 and the current soils that are on there.

3 MR. HUNT: Right.

4 The -- so this is what -- what we call
5 final grading plan. Now we have filled in the forest
6 area with soil, except for the channel in the back where
7 there's still fill over on this side, but not -- this cut
8 is still the outside of the cut as you saw before.

9 Most of our surface water is coming at us
10 this way and this way going into this western -- western
11 conveyance which carries it to -- to this point still on
12 the landfill top deck, at which point it goes into a
13 pipe, which would be a buried pipe that will take it
14 down.

15 I'll show you a layout -- this is the
16 primary surface that will remain. There's another
17 smaller one on this side.

18 Key elements of the grading. We have our
19 three to one slope on the front for stability. We have a
20 lower area here, which is for the -- which will
21 ultimately go when we go to the ball field where the
22 parking lot is.

23 At this point, we do intend to pave that
24 area as part of this construction.

25 And then there's sort of a -- this portion

1 right here is a step up from that -- from that parking
2 area up to the area where -- that will be preparing this
3 for the future -- for the future ball fields, and right
4 here, a little crown to the slope where water drains to
5 the east and the west.

6 Here's a ramp so we can get up to the
7 parking area up on top of the ball field, and those are
8 the major pieces.

9 There's some evaluation right now of the --
10 of the alignment of that surface water channel, whether
11 it might be moved a little bit. We're working with --
12 all of this has been done in conjunction with Planning in
13 terms of laying things out to the best that meet the
14 long-term goals of the site.

15 One -- I just wanted to show you a couple
16 details, show you where this is first. I'll back up one
17 slot.

18 I'm showing a detail that a goes across
19 this channel on the western side here, and what this
20 shows, we're going in there with two scenarios for how to
21 handle this -- how to handle this channel.

22 Real scenario one is where we excavate down
23 on the western side of the channel, and ideally when we
24 get to that, to our design elevations, in some areas
25 along that, not on the whole channel, we would anticipate

1 that we will get out of the landfill materials and
2 visibly not see landfill material. We will see the
3 borings and the test pit of the landfill.

4 If we are visually outside of the landfill
5 material on that western side, we'll go in, collect some
6 samples, do confirmation sampling, and if we can -- can
7 present that to DTSC and they're in agreement that we are
8 out of landfill material on that side, we would actually
9 leave this in the native condition over here and we would
10 end our normal cover on the eastern side of that channel.
11 So it will be native on the outside.

12 If on the other hand you come down in those
13 areas and still see debris on the surface, we are not
14 going to be going in and excavating down to try to chase
15 down the landfill debris, because ultimately the western
16 channel has to stay in the same place. Water has to get
17 out.

18 It has to be a certain rate, so we will
19 come in and excavate over three feet and bring back three
20 feet of fill.

21 So the ideal -- that's scenario one, and
22 scenario two, likely we'll have a combination of the two
23 out there depending on where we go.

24 So this is something that we're -- we'll
25 need to gear up and evaluate one of the areas where we

1 may be able to achieve that as a native condition.

2 This is just -- these are primary elements
3 of the surface water plan I started talking about before.
4 We have surface water coming in this way, coming in here.

5 Most of this gets routed around the western
6 side and goes into a pipe and gets down to to the
7 landfill.

8 What we have additionally is the smaller
9 conveyance that comes out to here. It will be a buried
10 pipe running also down and meeting at the toe of the
11 landfill.

12 At the toe, we will have to have energy
13 dissipation. We have -- because we have -- because this
14 is a landfill that's inlet, we have to design for a
15 hundred-year design storm event, a hundred year 24-hour
16 rainfall event, and so we've got about -- between the two
17 channels, we've got about 44 cubic feet per second at the
18 toe of the landfill at this point.

19 So we have to slow that flow down before we
20 discharge it to the future toe. Whatever they plan
21 there.

22 The -- we do have kind of -- to answer one
23 of the questions that we heard earlier on fillsite 1,
24 landfill 2, the area that we have paving here, we do
25 intend that that water goes into a drop inlet which will

1 have to go into a small basin for what we're currently
2 planning to get the sediment out and slow it down. It's
3 a water quality requirement. That's in process right
4 now.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: How about it being
6 clean, though?

7 MR. HUNT: Well, we're designing it to
8 meet the BMP criteria for water quality. So we have to
9 design for the surface water quality event and enter a
10 basin, discharge it over a certain period of time so that
11 it has some residence time in that basin before it goes
12 down into the --

13 MS. FANELLI: Similar to the BMPs that
14 were installed at the top of the landfill 10. They were
15 all installed to meet the same criteria.

16 So they take the first runoff off of the
17 asphalt pavement. It goes over vegetative grass area to
18 knock out the sediment, and then the water is able to
19 infiltrate, or if you can't, at a later date -- a few
20 hours later over a structure discharge.

21 MR. HUNT: At this point, there isn't --
22 well, so the water goes in, gets to the toe, which is
23 where we plan to do the treatment.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: So you're going to
25 treat outside the landfill print?

1 MR. HUNT: The only thing that we're
2 treating is runoff from the new area. It's not related
3 to the landfill, but yeah, you have to have --

4 MS. FANELLI: It's a required BMP for
5 paved surfaces.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Right. There seems
7 like -- I mean, not to just stick here, there were lots
8 of things that I would like to comment on, but on the
9 parking, you -- there are other options besides treating
10 it at the base.

11 You could treat it on the top. There would
12 be ways to deal with that. Sand filters. There are a
13 variety of things that you could do instead of taking up
14 space.

15 I mean --

16 MS. GAZAWAY: We are limited because of
17 the landfill cover. We don't want to encourage
18 percolation on the top of the landfill cover. So we're
19 trying to do it outside or beyond the landfill cover.

20 MS. FANELLI: Right. We have requirements
21 against ponding on the surface of the landfill, as well.
22 So we have alternatives.

23 MS. GAZAWAY: We're looking at that, but
24 we do have limitations and constraints without doing the
25 typical kind of treatment.

1 MR. HUNT: We're working through those,
2 meeting with Planning, Natural Resources, trying to
3 evaluate the appropriate BMPs and principles.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Right. That really
5 pops out as -- to me as something that could use a little
6 more work, because we don't want to contaminate lands,
7 use lands outside this to clean up stuff coming off the
8 landfill.

9 That just doesn't seem -- I'm just
10 reacting.

11 MS. FANELLI: It's not stuff coming off
12 the landfill. It's stuff coming off the parking lot. I
13 understand.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Exactly.

15 MS. FANELLI: I understand your intent

16 MR. HUNT: Okay.

17 MS. BLUM: I'm addressing the point.
18 Couldn't we have a higher standards since we're talking
19 about the restoration of the watershed here in terms of
20 how we treat water coming off the parking lot, which is
21 full of toxic chemicals and oil, and this goes all the
22 way -- this goes all the way to Quartermaster Reach and
23 then into the bay?

24 So I would think that we'd have a much
25 higher standard for this particular toe.

1 MS. GAZAWAY: We do think it is an
2 improved condition, because there is an asphalt parking
3 lot there right now.

4 MS. BLUM: I know what's there now. We're
5 building this beautiful watershed, so I would be looking
6 for something much more --

7 MS. FANELLI: We're implementing --

8 MS. BLUM: -- protective than what I just
9 heard.

10 MS. FANELLI: What we're implementing is
11 the current standard of practice and the state of the
12 art, and you are supposed to use wetlands, for example,
13 as treatment systems for this type of runoff, because
14 they are effective at treating it.

15 Because the goal is to do that treatment
16 before it gets anywhere near downstream or a marsh.

17 This is part of the equation. Maybe it
18 sounds a little counter-intuitive that you would use a
19 wetland as a treatment system.

20 We're not necessarily building a treatment
21 system here. This is a small area that is going to slow
22 down water and knock out sediments that comes off of just
23 that parking surface.

24 But it -- it is a -- it is a bioswale. It
25 is using the powers of nature to help us achieve water

1 quality goals so we do not see impacts further
2 downstream.

3 MS. BLUM: Right. So you're saying that
4 the water monitoring for what? Thirty years is going to
5 monitor the water for thirty years off this landfill?

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Five years. 2014.

7 MS. BLUM: So that's it?

8 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure where you're
9 getting 2014.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: From here.

11 MR. HUNT: There's an operations and
12 maintenance plan that will lay out all this criteria.
13 What level of monitoring for -- you know, for the various
14 elements, whether it's groundwater surface, gases, what's
15 going to be part of that operation.

16 MS. FANELLI: The guideline -- my
17 understanding for monitoring the landfill cover is a
18 thirty to fifty year horizon.

19 MR. HUNT: It's a thirty-year post-closure
20 maintenance period with the regulators being able to say
21 at any point keep going, so --

22 MS. BLUM: All right.

23 MR. HUNT: A quick -- this is a not quite
24 final -- the squiggly line hasn't been drawn yet. These
25 are some of the components of the landfill gas system out

1 here.

2 The -- the preamble for this is as -- for
3 those of you who looked through the feasibility study is
4 we have a landfill gas collection system out here.

5 We are not anticipating a significant
6 amount of landfill gas because this is -- there's been no
7 waste placed out here in forty years.

8 However, we do -- we want to allow a path
9 for gas to exit and not be trapped below the cover.

10 So we have -- so we will have a series of
11 vents basically where these red dots are. So that
12 landfill gas system goes below the cover system and
13 placed on top of that foundation layer of the previous
14 rating plan, we put the vents in various places.

15 They are located currently so that the
16 majority of them tie in with the future ball field fence
17 that will go up high above the fence or alongside of the
18 fence.

19 On the north face, we -- we've changed the
20 plan. So instead of having -- what you may have seen of
21 landfill gas composite over the cover, we now have a
22 series of trenches going down the base.

23 That was done in order to facilitate
24 planting of deeper rooted vegetation on the north face
25 that will go to vegetation that will kind of screen back

1 the landfill in some areas. We have continuous
2 composite, along the trench layout.

3 Yes.

4 MR. BUDROE: Does the waste gas require
5 QMB?

6 MR. HUNT: It's very, very low. It's --
7 with this landfill at -- you know, which has been off-
8 gassing for at least forty years, the amount of -- when
9 we go through all the EPA methodologies for evaluating
10 the amount of -- the amount of gas that we may be dealing
11 with, it falls underneath any of those thresholds, but
12 we're still allowing it -- we're allowing it to do what
13 it's been doing for forty plus years, but we're on the
14 tail end of that gas collection.

15 MS. FANELLI: We don't even necessarily
16 expect to have significant gas at all in these vents.

17 To the extent that we monitor and there's
18 nothing there, then we can close that vent potentially
19 and do adaptive management, so to speak, to minimize our
20 maintenance by closing off certain vents if we don't need
21 them.

22 It's a lot of caution. It's a belt and
23 suspenders, but it's important to do it right the first
24 time.

25 MR. HUNT: Okay.

1 Yeah. When you take a look at the report,
2 those are the primary elements that you see that we're
3 working through.

4 I'm sure there are questions.

5 MS. FANELLI: Or comments.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: My own personal
7 comments are just there's a lot of detail. I mean, the
8 parking lot thing jumped out, but I think we'd all like a
9 chance to look at it, think about it a little bit.

10 MR. HUNT: Yeah. I mean, this is --
11 this -- at many levels, it's grading designed by
12 consensus in that in order to be all the various -- we're
13 attempting to get back on the western side to be able to
14 do planting there.

15 We have a ball field, and there must be
16 parking for that, and so it's all how you make this work.
17 So this is compared to fillsite 1, landfill 2.

18 MS. FANELLI: This first year we'll be
19 left fairly bare and its objective is that the
20 landscaping plan hasn't been completed and the
21 landscaping plant hasn't been propagated.

22 What we've done is created a design that
23 meets all of the mediation objectives and designs the
24 maximum going forward.

25 At the same time, we're not building really

1 any of the ball field elements at all, but we're trying
2 to work with our Planning Department who is anticipating
3 certain needs so that we can facilitate it when they're
4 ready to go.

5 So there's a big flat area that will
6 ultimately be designed into some type of ball field, but
7 the ball field design's not there.

8 MR. HUNT: For example, if we didn't pave
9 this area now and then went in to do pavement, we would
10 have to do significant landfill cover to do that.

11 We're trying to do the development now to
12 save for the future.

13 MS. FANELLI: There is an existing parking
14 lot up there. So what we're doing basically is replacing
15 it.

16 And that configuration -- I don't even know
17 if it's a final configuration, but it's their best guess
18 right now of how they want to fit pieces into that area.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Can you tell us the
20 dimensions of the field that would fit in that space and
21 how many parking spaces that space will accommodate?

22 MR. HUNT: We didn't do a parking
23 evaluation, so I'm not sure.

24 The field is -- especially soccer field
25 size. When we first started out, we thought of a

1 soccer/baseball field, and in order to match the size and
2 strength and not have to push fill out into the west
3 lands.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: I asked because I play
5 soccer and they give you all different kinds of field
6 sizes, whatever fits and it would just be nice to know
7 what we're going to get.

8 MS. FANELLI: And quite honestly, we can't
9 tell you, because I think there are different
10 configurations that fit in that space, and I don't think
11 they have made any decision yet as to exactly what it's
12 going to be.

13 I don't want to set Chris up to try to give
14 you dimensions, because I think it's still under
15 consideration.

16 MR. HUNT: Yes. We know that there's an
17 area here where the concept -- there's a fence outline
18 where the field will be, but that may change, and we know
19 that there's room here to get to the path for future
20 trail around that fence, and we connect up to this trail
21 back here.

22 So there's -- but we --

23 MS. GAZAWAY: We provided maximum
24 flexibility for their future plans, but they haven't been
25 finalized.

1 MS. FANELLI: I think our Planning
2 Department is trying to fast-track this.

3 Jim, I know you're probably interested, but
4 getting our people together to get out there to get
5 somebody to develop it. I think they have the same
6 thought process for the Paul Goode field site, as well.

7 They know that they won't be able to do
8 this until -- the earliest 2013 is when they think they
9 would be doing construction of a ball field at this site.

10 MR. HUNT: Yes.

11 MS. CHEEVER: So I am wondering --

12 MS. BLUM: Go ahead.

13 MS. CHEEVER: -- whether the public
14 process works in such a way that you -- as you do the
15 design as your assignment have access to comments that
16 were made about the General Plan, the comments during the
17 period and whether any of those comments give you ideas
18 or affects the design that you do.

19 MR. HUNT: Well, the -- what we've been
20 doing at these meetings, rather regular meetings with the
21 other -- with the Planning Department and Natural
22 Resources and Forestry and they're giving us feedback as
23 we go through and we're trying to meet the criteria that
24 they give us.

25 So while I haven't spent a lot of time --

1 MS. CHEEVER: Public comments.

2 MR. HUNT: I'm not specifically designing
3 to public comments. I'm designing to the criteria that
4 should be incorporated by those comments, and I'm telling
5 you we have gone many, many rounds on this in order to
6 meet the criteria.

7 MS. FANELLI: And our Planning Department
8 is following and reviewing regularly the commitments as
9 part of the Tennessee Hollow EA. So that's their
10 planning document that they're referring to and looking
11 at future land use here.

12 We defer to them. Remediation is not
13 interpreting existing planning documents. We're looking
14 to our planning documents and our EMT.

15 MS. CHEEVER: The comments on April 30th,
16 those comments.

17 MS. FANELLI: Yes. Sure.

18 MS. CHEEVER: To give a possibly over-
19 simplified example, I think a number of comments have
20 expressed the concern that the water channel on the wells
21 side may fail over time.

22 So is that something that you're aware that
23 there's concern about that and that did design takes
24 account of?

25 MR. HUNT: Well --

1 MS. GAZAWAY: You have access to all the
2 public comments that have been made, yes.

3 MS. FANELLI: They've been responded to.
4 I know DTSC is working on them now. We've given them
5 some input and they're working on it now. There's a
6 hydraulic analysis that goes with their grading plan that
7 goes to DTSC for approval.

8 So yes, there's engineering criteria about
9 that design to avoid failure, to make sure that the it's
10 designed to hold. If that answers the question.

11 MR. HUNT: It's a relatively flat channel
12 over there and the -- while -- while the number like
13 forty cubic feet per second may sound like a lot, the
14 velocities are fairly low for the channel.

15 So, you know, we have to design for this
16 hundred-year -- for this hundred-year event and we -- we
17 have to do -- you know, we have to incorporate efficient
18 conservatism in order to design to avoid a failure.

19 Erosion is something that we don't have to
20 have in the channel. We want the vegetation to survive,
21 so we're evaluating velocity and all that, and that's
22 also why there's a maintenance plan in case there's --
23 you know, if there's excessive erosion at some location,
24 then we would maintain it and we can be more aggressive.

25 But this is designed for a fairly sizable

1 rainfall event. We have three feet of cover soils in
2 those channels, as well.

3 MS. KRAMER: So are you excavating down
4 and then putting that three feet of cover so that it's
5 not just three feet higher in elevation.

6 MR. HUNT: Yeah. Well, if you look --

7 MS. GAZAWAY: Yes. We're excavating down
8 and then replacing that material.

9 MR. HUNT: This is the -- these the
10 original topography. Some people see topography. It's
11 regular up there and we're turning it into something
12 that's more controlled.

13 So what that means in some areas, we have
14 to excavate several feet, and some areas we have to
15 excavate a few inches and some areas we have to fill a
16 couple feet, and ultimately we put -- just in order to
17 meet our -- in order to meet this kind of pre-cover
18 grading plan.

19 So we have to excavate more back here if we
20 want to bring in a thicker fill section, and maybe we
21 have a little bit more fill here where we have this step
22 and then we come up with our clean fill on top of that.

23 MS. KRAMER: Okay. So in other words, at
24 the corners where you have that swale, that drainage
25 swale, you -- you don't have to grade back from there

1 because you're -- essentially the inner edge of that
2 channel is down. It's not above existing grade.

3 MR. HUNT: Yeah. We went -- we went --
4 this blue dashed line is our -- our landfill. We went
5 out to that line, matched current topo there. Cut down
6 three to one.

7 MS. KRAMER: From outside that boundary,
8 you cut down.

9 MR. HUNT: Inside the boundary. There's a
10 couple areas where we kind of break out. Any work
11 outside that line has to be done -- we can't move
12 anything from within that line to outside that line.

13 MS. KRAMER: So you're meeting existing
14 grade at the boundary and then you're cutting in from
15 there.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Chris, it might be good to
17 show the cross-section. That will demand that.

18 MR. HUNT: This green line here is
19 existing topo. These are scenarios -- this is existing
20 topo. This is the theoretical body of waste, and it gets
21 thicker as we come down the blue line. This will be
22 landfill material and this is native soil.

23 We come to the landfill limit and we cut
24 down from three to one to create our western drainage,
25 and there -- and so if we get below this blue line and we

1 don't see any debris in that cut, then we collect samples
2 and we send them to the lab and we produce a report for
3 DTSC to see if we can -- if they'll let us leave that
4 slope like that.

5 If, however, the samples come back and say
6 no, there's contamination there or we visibly see that
7 there is still landfill debris at this elevation, then we
8 have to go do this and cut another three.

9 Basically, we have to come out a landfill
10 limit. We cut off at the minimum stable slope -- the
11 steepest stable slope we can get, so we go outside the
12 footprint as little as possible, but we put three feet of
13 horticultural soil on top of that.

14 MS. GAZAWAY: It's true that the fallway
15 of our drainage channel is below the grade.

16 MR. HUNT: Yes.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I was wondering what
18 considerations got you to the design of the field and
19 then the step to the parking lot and if you could --
20 there's something in my mind about that step and I'm
21 wondering if you could describe how steep it might be --

22 MR. HUNT: It's all -- slopes out here are
23 three to one. We haven't gone steeper than that. Even
24 most of the channel slopes are three to one. The -- or
25 flatter.

1 The step is a combination of needing to --
2 you know, we have -- we have an existing parking area
3 here by building 810, and this is the entrance to the
4 parking.

5 We have a hundred percent ramp for cars to
6 get up on that parking area, and that keeps this
7 elevation low.

8 And then for the field, we're basically
9 trying to do a site balance at that top elevation.

10 MS. GAZAWAY: And that slope will be
11 planned.

12 MS. KRAMER: Between cut and fill balance?

13 MR. HUNT: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm not sure where
15 you're anticipating the limits of the field, but I'll
16 just throw this out as a crazy response because I'm just
17 seeing it, but you got an edge of the field and you run
18 past the edge of the field.

19 Are there issues with kids' balls
20 because --

21 MR. HUNT: There's perimeter fence all
22 along there.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: So they'd have to run a
24 hurdle to the fence or --

25 MR. HUNT: That's part of that ball field

1 planning.

2 MS. FANELLI: But that's not something
3 that Remediation is in control of. I don't want to
4 speculate on that design.

5 Because none of us here have any knowledge
6 of the background of construction regulations are.
7 That's a different group at the trust.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate that, and
9 I don't mean to cause any defensiveness. I'm just trying
10 to react to thinking about kids playing on the field.

11 MS. GAZAWAY: Our intent was to maximize
12 that space for future use, and we investigated many
13 alternatives, including virtual retaining wall, deep
14 slopes and other things.

15 So this was the optimum consideration that
16 met the future need.

17 MS. FANELLI: That was dictated not by
18 Remediation, but our Planning folks who are relying on
19 commitment made in the EA.

20 I'm not trying to be defensive, Doug. I
21 just don't want to speculate about the balls and things
22 because we really have no clue about how it ultimately
23 works.

24 MS. SEGAL: Then how do we know there's
25 going to be a fence?

1 MS. FANELLI: I'm sorry?

2 MS. SEGAL: How do we know that the
3 playing field will, in fact, have a fence? We don't, do
4 we?

5 MS. FANELLI: I don't know if Remediation
6 has position on whether it has a fence or not. What we
7 need to do is we make sure that we've maximized -- we've
8 constructed this so there's maximum flexibility for
9 future land use.

10 We've taken our cues from our Planning
11 Department, and when it is ready to be developed, I'm not
12 sure what that process will be, but the need for a fence
13 or not need for a fence will all be laid out.

14 We all presume there's going to be a need
15 for a fence. I understand that.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Honestly, I'm not --
17 I'm not just kidding. I mean, if you've ever watched a
18 soccer game, people shooting at the goal, there will be
19 balls way over the top and down in that parking lot and
20 out of the -- I mean, it's just a practical
21 consideration, something to think about as you're going
22 ahead in the design. Just think about -- I just offer
23 that.

24 MS. GAZAWAY: I think Planning is well
25 aware of that and we've been working with them on the

1 site of this and trying to provide the maximum
2 flexibility, the maximum space consideration, and that's
3 what's taken into account in our gas vents, as well, our
4 gas elevation.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, okay.

6 MS. FANELLI: What we can say is that the
7 landfill will be safely closed regardless of whether it's
8 trees or the creek or a picnic area or parking lot or a
9 ball field. That's our objective is to make sure that it
10 has a proper closing.

11 MS. GAZAWAY: Theoretically if they decide
12 to expand and take out the parking lot, they could. They
13 don't have to get into the landfill at all if they're
14 filling.

15 Again, it provides the maximum flexibility
16 for what they want to do in the future.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate that
18 you've been through a process. We didn't get to go with
19 you on that journey. We're seeing your result, and so
20 we're -- I at least am commenting on what I see, and I
21 don't know all the things you're trying to balance.

22 MS. GAZAWAY: Okay. We've spent a great
23 deal of time optimizing it.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: I have the report. Is this
25 going to be updated? It says that the project will be

1 done in March 2012. I've heard 2013.

2 MS. FANELLI: Can I take a look at the
3 page you have?

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Sure.

5 MS. GAZAWAY: Our intent is to do the
6 final grading and cover this season starting next, you
7 know, month or so.

8 MR. WRIGHT: So hopefully by the end of
9 September.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: But it hasn't been approved
11 yet.

12 MS. GAZAWAY: Yeah. We can't start until
13 we get approved.

14 MS. FANELLI: This is not showing a two-
15 year construction period at this point in time. This is
16 showing remediation construction happening from June to
17 September, and what you're talking about is the
18 construction completion report.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Right. So I heard 2013.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: Well, that -- there's the --
21 there's the construction --

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Are there two seasons?

23 MS. GAZAWAY: There's the construction of
24 the cover which we anticipate doing this summer if we get
25 all the approvals.

1 There's a planting plan that will start
2 next season, and 2013 is the earliest that they will do
3 any ball field improvement. That's a separate project,
4 but that's the earliest.

5 MS. FANELLI: I have it shown on that
6 schedule, you are correct, the planting, the planting
7 season, and I will add that for the next quarterly
8 report.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: We would hope that we
11 wouldn't have any grading on that second season, but
12 we'll see.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: So I'm trying to
14 understand. So you're saying we're going to do the
15 grading in September this year.

16 MS. FANELLI: That's what we're trying to
17 do.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: So then it will be all
19 waterproof by the end of September.

20 MS. GAZAWAY: Yes.

21 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: And then it will be -- work
23 will be happening over the rainy season. I was trying to
24 understand what that was.

25 MS. FANELLI: That's the construction

1 completion report. That's office paperwork.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Never mind.

3 MS. KRAMER: And again, there's no
4 excavation. The grade change to get down three feet or
5 whatever to accommodate the three feet that's added is
6 just going to be by regrading and -- moving stuff around.

7 MR. HUNT: We're moving material around
8 within those limits. We're not excavating.

9 MS. KRAMER: There's nothing being
10 taken --

11 MS. FANELLI: There's nothing planned.
12 There's no excess waste at this point. We're trying to
13 plan to have to import more just to be a little bit safe.

14 If we have more waste volume, we import
15 waste material.

16 MS. GAZAWAY: Cover.

17 MS. FANELLI: I'm sorry. Cover material,
18 not waste.

19 MR. HUNT: That's a whole different
20 permit.

21 MR. CHESTER: I'm not sure where the final
22 design stands, but ball fields in some parts of the city
23 are going to artificial turf for various reasons.

24 Since this is the cap of a landfill.

25 MS. FANELLI: I know it's being

1 considered. I don't think a final decision's been made.
2 But it is certainly on the table with grass.

3 MR. CHESTER: Yeah. And the serpentine
4 soil, just in realtime, is that soil still stockpiled out
5 there?

6 MR. WRIGHT: It's gone.

7 MR. CHESTER: Oh, it's gone.

8 MR. WRIGHT: The big one. There is --
9 there is another stockpile, a mixture of serpentine soils
10 and such, but that belongs to the contractor with Doyle
11 Drive. But the serpentine soils themselves have been
12 placed.

13 MS. FANELLI: And landfill 2.

14 MR. CHESTER: Okay.

15 MS. GAZAWAY: We're trying to get all the
16 stockpiles off that site, as well.

17 MS. FANELLI: I think our goal is to -- we
18 have been -- none of this is new information, really, to
19 DTSC. We have been informally checking with them on our
20 design pieces and we've gone forward, but we are
21 anticipating submitting the draft.

22 We don't call it remedial work plan.
23 You're calling it a different document.

24 MR. HUNT: Yeah.

25 MS. FANELLI: And all of the complete

1 plans. I'm pushing it pretty hard, because we are a
2 little bit behind schedule by a few weeks, but I'm hoping
3 by the end of next week basically things are buttoned up
4 and it's sitting with Perry Meyer at DTSC.

5 MR. HUNT: We will have a complete version
6 very soon.

7 MS. FANELLI: We've been sharing pieces of
8 it. We're not trying to set this up so we violate major
9 elements.

10 DTSC will approve this as a whole package.
11 When we submit it, you'll get information that it's been
12 submitted. We'll post it on Envirostore. You can ask
13 questions and talk to us about it.

14 MR. HUNT: Okay.

15 MS. FANELLI: Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much for
17 those presentations.

18 We received a note from Radhika that she
19 wouldn't be coming tonight due to travel restrictions.
20 Agnes is away on vacation, so item 5 delete.

21 Any new business? Any public comment?

22 So are there any action items or agenda
23 items that people are thinking of?

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: Quarterly report.

25 MS. FANELLI: Next time will be a

1 quarterly report. I have to dig through it. Text is not
2 that many.

3 MS. FANELLI: It laid out pretty nice.
4 It's like twelve pages of text. Several tables that
5 outline all the major deliverables, and then the
6 financial tables and then the schedules.

7 MS. SEGAL: Right.

8 MS. FANELLI: But I'm always open if
9 there's a way that you would like to see that information
10 that is simpler. That's fine.

11 MS. SEGAL: I have a question, Doug. Have
12 there been any public comments to the Trust or Park
13 Service about some of the construction that's going on on
14 the closures? Not Doyle Drive, but -- it's now the
15 season when people are using the Presidio more and it's
16 light at night, which I love.

17 But any kind of issues coming up?

18 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm not aware of what
19 people are commenting on.

20 MS. SEGAL: We're not cutting down any
21 more trees recently.

22 MS. FANELLI: There's a moratorium as far
23 as I understand in area B at the Presidio on tree
24 cutting. So there's not any trees to be cut down on area
25 B.

1 If there are trees that are dead or dying
2 and going to fall on anybody, those trees are going to be
3 removed, but there is a moratorium right now on tree
4 cutting.

5 MS. SEGAL: And what about the path, you
6 know, by the -- you know, at the ocean -- on the ocean
7 side, the coastal bluff.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I don't know. Do you
9 have any information on that path? It was by Baker Beach
10 1.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: 1 and 1A. There are
12 remediation sites there. The Trust is working on them
13 and we're waiting to get information from the Trust.

14 I believe that because of the timing of
15 different things, most of the trail segments would not be
16 able to be built in the immediate future.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Do you happen to know what's
18 happening with the repairs of those one or two spots on
19 landfill 10?

20 MS. FANELLI: I certainly do.

21 MS. CHEEVER: It seems not much was
22 changed in that.

23 MS. FANELLI: They have not been repaired
24 yet. We've been waiting for the sites to fully dry out
25 before we do repairs on those two areas.

1 We have selected a contractor to do the
2 repairs. ERRG will be doing it. We have the same soil
3 from Napa brown. We have yards of that stockpiled at the
4 dust bowl, for lack of a better word. That's the soil
5 that will be used to repair those two areas.

6 And then they'll be planted in the fall,
7 and the plants are propagated. We have them at the
8 nursery and we'll take them when it's time to repair
9 the -- when it's time to plant them.

10 Right now we're planning to plant them in
11 October after the first rains.

12 MS. CHEEVER: I guess the arbor has been
13 pulled up. That's why I thought it was started, but that
14 was pulled up so it can dry.

15 MS. FANELLI: Probably so. Ryan Seilbach
16 is managing that project. I think we're trying to get
17 out there by early June.

18 I know he's got a construction set up by
19 the end of May. Brian's going to work on that before we
20 get up there.

21 MS. BLUM: An action item. We can hear
22 from NPS -- I just heard, I thought, Brian, that you said
23 the trail building had been postponed indefinitely.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: It had to be postponed
25 for most of the segment until after the bridge

1 restoration and --

2 MS. BLUM: It was alarming not to hear
3 that part.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: The remediation will need
5 to go forth.

6 MS. BLUM: Maybe we can hear from NPS of
7 all the sites that they have outstanding and get a feel
8 for what's happening.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Sure.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

11 Anything else that's coming up for action
12 items, agenda items?

13 Again, I would like to thank all of you for
14 your presentations for being out here tonight. Thank you
15 to all the RAB members for your comments for being here.

16 Any other comments before we close?

17 Without objection, meeting adjourned. Thanks very much.

18 (The meeting concluded at 8:43 PM).

19 ---o0o---

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

4 Eileen Fanelli

Angela Liang

5 Angela Anderson

Brian Ullensvang

6 Aaron Roth

Agnes Farres

7 Julie Cheever

Gloria Gee

8 Jim Ketcham

Toni Kramer

9 Jan Monaghan

Sara Segal

10 Sam Berman

Jan Blum

11

Special Guest:

12

John Fortuna

13

---o0o---

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on June 14, 2011, 7:06 PM at the
17 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
18 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
19 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
20 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	5
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. LFE Groundwater - John Fortuna, Geosyntec	26
8	B. Quarterly Report - Eileen Fanelli, Trust	7
9	C. Update on Remediation - Brian Ullensvang	46
10	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
11	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
12	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - No report	
13	6) New Business -	76
14	7) Public Comment - None	
15	8) Action Items and Agenda Items:	80
16	9) Adjournment:	82
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone to
2 the regular meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory
3 Board for June 2011. It's good to see everyone here. I
4 hope your start of your summer is going well, and
5 certainly it's nice to see the sun out here in the -- as
6 part of San Francisco.

7 I'd like to welcome everyone, the Presidio
8 Trust, their contractors, National Park Service, the
9 regulatory community and the RAB members that are here
10 tonight.

11 Before we get going, as I see some new faces
12 around the room. Perhaps we'll do a brief introduction.

13 I'm Doug Kern, a community member. Been on
14 board since 1994.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: I am Mark Youngkin,
16 community co-chair.

17 MS. FANELLI: Eileen Fanelli, Presidio
18 Trust remediation manager.

19 MS. LIANG: Angela Liang, Trust.

20 MR. FORTUNA: I'm John Fortuna,
21 environmental consultants to the Trust.

22 MS. KRAMER: Toni Kramer, community
23 member.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: Jan Monaghan, community
25 member.

1 MS. SEGAL: Sara Segal, community member.

2 MS. FARRES: Agnes Farres, Water Board.

3 MS. BLUM: Jan Blum, community member.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: Brian Ullensvang from the
5 National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation
6 Area.

7 MR. ROTH: I'm Aaron Roth, also with the
8 National Park Service. I'm going to be joining you guys
9 this evening. It's my first time attending this evening.
10 Perhaps some of you know my predecessor. He retired
11 recently, and thank you for having me.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks very much for
13 being here tonight.

14 MS. FANELLI: And Andrea Anderson is back
15 there, Presidio Trust.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Andrea, you're
17 certainly welcome up here if you'd like at any point to
18 move up here closer.

19 MS. ANDERSON: I'm fine. Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Are there any -- does
21 everyone have an agenda? Are there any additions or
22 changes tonight to the agenda? Any announcements or old
23 business?

24 I do have one announcement that I spoke with
25 Lew Stringer today of the Trust and he is working on the

1 restoration of graded area 9 and landfill 8 where there
2 are a lot of the sand dunes and has done a lot of --
3 there's a lot of seeding, but not necessarily planting.

4 And he indicated that he's pleased with
5 what's going on. He wanted to make an offer to members
6 of the RAB that if they wanted to go out with him and see
7 what was happening at those sites, he would be available
8 to do that.

9 And so I think if that's something that
10 you'd like to do, we can arrange the time offline. Just
11 send me a note, an e-mail message that that's something
12 you'd like to do and perhaps put a time that would work
13 for you, a couple of times, and then we'll try to set
14 something up if there's interest.

15 Again, that's going back out to landfill 8,
16 graded area 9 to look at the restoration.

17 Any other announcements?

18 Very good. Moving on to item 4.

19 MS. FANELLI: I think will go pretty
20 quickly. It's just slides if that's all right, but if
21 you'd like --

22 MS. BLUM: Could you raise your voice just
23 a little bit and throw it this way?

24 MS. FANELLI: I can.

25 The question was this is item B on the

1 agenda. I'm happy to make it item B. It's only the
2 standard slides. If you'd like it and quickly and leave
3 more time for groundwater.

4 Okay. Thanks.

5 Okay. This is our standard quarterly
6 report. You all got a copy of it a while ago. I did
7 receive some comments, specific questions from Jan and
8 from Doug, so I will try to answer those.

9 This is our quarterly report through March
10 31st, so it's a little bit outdated from the standpoint
11 that things have happened since then, and I'll give nod
12 to those.

13 Milestones, costs to date and performance,
14 some program updates and then our next quarter
15 activities.

16 The milestones through March 31st were
17 significant. DTSC certified the Crissy Field RAP. That
18 was a major milestone. We were thrilled and pleased with
19 that.

20 They also certified tank 1362. This was a
21 tank that had been closed by Water Board, but it was also
22 listed as a miscellaneous site in the consent agreement.

23 We have twelve additional closures from
24 DTSC, and as you're well aware, the Draft FS/RAP for
25 landfill E was issued.

1 We had in situ soil treatment. That has
2 since been approved, and we actually have most of that
3 infrastructure into the ground. I'll get into that in a
4 little bit.

5 We submitted no further action request,
6 closure request for basically all the tanks. There may
7 be one or two that's not in that bunch, but at this
8 point, 99 percent of the tanks in our tank database are
9 with Agnes and the Water Board for closure and approval.

10 We issued an updated closure request for
11 the 1065 cap site for comments, and also requests for the
12 remaining FDS segments, and also issued request for tank
13 sites.

14 So we've continued to make significant
15 progress.

16 Budget-wise, it looks very similar to what
17 it's looked like in the past. Our current estimated cost
18 at completion is on the order of 162 million dollars when
19 you consider the original Army advance and you offset the
20 interest earned and receipts from claims made primarily
21 against the Army and some against Zurich for
22 contamination and offsets from the Trust, primarily for
23 labor cost, which are not considered allowable in the
24 Zurich Policy.

25 We're looking at 34 million dollars for

1 remaining costs for known and unknown sites, for which we
2 are looking for coverage under our RSL and REEL policies
3 with Zurich.

4 This summary of the detail that's in your
5 quarterly report, it breaks out the costs to date
6 relative to the 1999 budget.

7 This is for our main activities, CERCLA
8 sites, lead-based paint, petroleum, the tasks included in
9 administration with the Trust.

10 By March 31st, we had about eighty million in
11 allowable costs. Obviously we've spent significantly
12 more than that. Not all of those costs are allowable.
13 Some of them are costs that were just the cost of doing
14 business, so our labor, the cost of the policy, et
15 cetera.

16 The top six projects with activity. Again,
17 no surprise. The final invoices from planting and work
18 at 10 and 9 came in, and there's always a lag to when we
19 finish work to when we get invoices in.

20 Fillsite 1 and landfill 2 of course had
21 invoices coming in from the work that we did there.
22 Landfill E, a lot of the costs associated with design
23 work and the -- actually, at this point, not so much
24 design as it was completing all the planning documents,
25 the RAP and the FS.

1 And then we've been spending a fair amount
2 of money lately on the lead-based paint program, so we
3 did quite a bit of work in the Main Post. That gives you
4 an idea of the costs for those projects.

5 There was some specific questions. This
6 was a slide I actually didn't get a chance to fill out,
7 but let me respond to Doug. This was questions that you
8 had about fillsite 1 and landfill 2.

9 At this point, I'm not sure that we're
10 going to change the budgets that are shown in the actual
11 quarterly report for those projects. We carried a budget
12 of 5.8 million for fillsite 1 and 8.2 or so for landfill
13 2.

14 Those budget numbers as you know are
15 complete. They're from planning through post
16 restoration. They carry contingencies. We have used
17 some of the contingencies for actual work that had been
18 designed, particularly in the second year of grading
19 before we went in. But at this point, I'm not sure if
20 those numbers will change.

21 We're looking at trying to of course come
22 in at those budget numbers. There is the potential
23 they'll go up a little bit, maybe come in under a little
24 bit, but we're going to be hitting that margin.

25 The contract is one element of those costs.

1 The original bid for both sites combined if you remember
2 for last year, and that got us through winterization. So
3 basic rating, winterization was a 8.2 million dollar
4 contract for EBI.

5 We have since set all the final grading
6 plans for that site, and it looks like the costs when
7 we're doing are going to be more like 8.9 million for
8 EBI.

9 Again, all those costs, I can account for
10 them in detail, if you need them, but it's the trail
11 replacement putting back, it's the stream channels,
12 restoration at the bottom where we finalized the design
13 for our sedimentation basin and retention basin which
14 will ultimately become a wetland area.

15 There's lots of different elements that
16 lead into that, but it's about 8.9. That's what we're
17 anticipating that remedial construction costs for two
18 sites combined will be.

19 In terms of -- you asked me specifically
20 about the terraces.

21 The terrace construction originally in
22 landfill 2 was 338 or thereabouts thousand dollars as in
23 the rough grading.

24 In working through the final design, you're
25 all aware that we're going to leave the terraces in place

1 because they are the earth retaining structures, but
2 we're burying them much like we did in landfill 8.

3 So we have the moving depths in that area,
4 but we also have the earth being retained, but we don't
5 have geo tubes and other structures which could interfere
6 with plant roots in the ground.

7 The cost for the final grading, those -- in
8 that area is going to be on the order of about \$280,000
9 additional on top of that, and all of that's in that
10 anticipated increase from 8.2 million for EBI to 8.9.

11 So does that answer the question?

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes. Thank you.

13 MR. KETCHAM: How are you going to cover
14 the 34 million? What's the plan for the --

15 MS. FANELLI: The 34 million is primarily
16 being covered through Zurich North American, our
17 policy --

18 MR. KETCHAM: I thought that was costs
19 above and beyond what the insurance would cover?

20 MS. FANELLI: No. The RSL is for costs
21 above our self-insured retention, which is a hundred
22 million dollars. We're not --

23 MR. KETCHAM: So is more coming from the
24 insurance company?

25 MS. FANELLI: Yes. We're not at that

1 hundred million self-insurance retention. We're at about
2 eighty million for that self-insurance retention. We're
3 anticipating reaching the hundred million mark sometime
4 third quarter FY 12, and at that point, we would expect
5 funding for all the remaining costs that are allowable
6 for sites that are classified as known sites from Zurich.

7 MR. KETCHAM: You're still completely
8 covered by the insurance money for all the remediation
9 work that's being done?

10 MS. FANELLI: We'd like to believe we are.
11 So that's not exactly wood. Plastic.

12 Unknown sites is a slightly different
13 story. We do have coverage. There's a larger deduct --
14 there's a deductible per incident and then there's a
15 certain burden on us to prove that the loss has occurred,
16 and those costs are not necessarily covered.

17 If you look at the quarterly report, we
18 break out our estimated liability, if you will, for
19 unknown sites versus the known sites, and as we've gone
20 forward, our unknown site costs have decreased a little
21 bit.

22 Our known site costs have increased a
23 little bit and that's because as we get closer to the
24 program, we can define a little bit better what the work
25 is going to be.

1 The schedule is nothing surprising.

2 Obviously what we're working on is finishing up fillsite
3 1 and landfill 2. We're working on drafting RI reports
4 for Baker Beach 1 and we're hoping to give that to the
5 Park Service for their review by the end of the month.

6 Landfill E, the final RAP is in process.
7 Obviously we don't have a signed document to put in front
8 of you today, but I know Genevieve has been working
9 closely with Denise Tsuji at DTSC and we're expecting the
10 final response document and the final RAP in the next
11 several days signed, and you know that we've submitted
12 the final.

13 The remedial action work plan, we're
14 calling it an RDIP, and we've gotten some comments back
15 from Perry that are fairly minor.

16 So we're expecting that that's going to be
17 within the next two weeks after we've finalized the RAP
18 and response document, we'll get official approvals to
19 proceed.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Excuse me. On the
21 landfill E with respect to DTSC, I understand that
22 Virginia retired.

23 MS. FANELLI: Virginia retired.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Is Denise doing her
25 stuff?

1 MS. FANELLI: Denise has been has been
2 taking a much more hands-on approach. She's been working
3 with Perry, who you met, Meyers the engineer to do a fair
4 amount of the heavy lifting, and then we've had a new
5 DTSC person.

6 Her name is Lynn -- I'm sorry. I want to
7 say Nakashima, but I'm not positive. She has been
8 helping her the last several days with the final comment
9 response documents.

10 MS. BLUM: Who will ultimately take
11 Leslie's place?

12 MS. FANELLI: I don't believe DTSC is
13 hiring, so that is something that I'm interested in
14 knowing, as well.

15 Denise is struggling to shift workload
16 among her staff, and I -- she has not told me who -- if
17 it's going to be the same -- a new person with the same
18 site or if she's going to get stuff that Medi has had and
19 others have had.

20 Other highlights. We're working on a work
21 plan for Baker Beach 2. I think that's going to the Park
22 Service for review about the same time frame as the RI,
23 Baker Beach 1, and here looking we're hoping to be out in
24 the field by the spring, that makes up Baker Beach 2 as
25 well as what has been commonly referred to as the

1 recycling area. That is under process.

2 6B, we are simply at this time compiling
3 data that's been in many reports into a formal RI. There
4 is no DTSC person assigned to those sites yet, and once
5 we get our reports pulled together, we'll be asking
6 Denise for somebody to take over and help us with the
7 next steps there.

8 And 8A, URS has been working on their
9 updated RI for DTSC review. Remember URS did a couple of
10 seasons of field investigations.

11 They're really just pulling all of that
12 together into one document per DTSC's request so that
13 DTSC has a document that they can review and either say
14 yes, your investigations are complete, or no, they are
15 not complete.

16 Of course we anticipate that the
17 investigations are complete at this point, but that's
18 what we're working on.

19 This is a tad behind schedule, and
20 Genevieve has been working really to get to get URS to do
21 that.

22 937. We're basically in the process of
23 procuring our contractor. Those design documents have
24 all been submitted to DTSC. That was all work that was
25 being done under the former Crissy Field draft, and we're

1 hoping to be in construction on that site in July. So
2 that one's moving ahead pretty quickly.

3 If you remember 937, the interior of the
4 building, we're taking up the slab. We're removing
5 soils, and we had contamination. We're replacing the
6 venting system and putting the slab back.

7 207/231. Work plan for in situ treatment
8 was approved. It has been substantially constructed, and
9 we got a little bit ahead of ourselves.

10 We required an air permit. We didn't
11 realize because the base wall is within a thousand feet
12 of the site, that there's an extra permitting hurdle that
13 we have to go through, a thirty-day review period.

14 So we are working with the Air Board to get
15 that permit taken care of and then we're ready to turn
16 the system on.

17 So this was a little bit of a surprise for
18 us, but critical path-wise, it doesn't affect us too
19 much. It just means that we won't be turning the system
20 off. It is not weather depending, so it's not a real
21 problem for us.

22 Lobos Creek. Jan, you had a question on
23 that. I went back to my notes because I had to and I
24 remembered we had a meeting in February of 2010. The
25 Park Service was present, DTSC, Water Board and at the

1 conclusion of that, there were some actions, but we the
2 Trust were waiting for some directions back from DTSC and
3 the Water Board.

4 And I understand, Agnes, that you guys
5 spoke, too.

6 MS. FARRES: Right. In March 2010, the
7 Water Board and DTSC met to talk about Lobos Creek, and
8 since it was CERCLA site, DTSC is taking the lead.

9 And so at that time they had decided that
10 we were going to ask for additional data from Water. I'm
11 not sure.

12 MS. FANELLI: I never got that request,
13 and so it's there to be addressed. It's on the schedule,
14 but it is -- it's a little bit in limbo right now. We
15 are waiting for DTSC.

16 MS. BLUM: Is this investigation going to
17 be with the creek itself and not with the effluent that
18 is coming out through the pipe at Baker Beach? Is this
19 all one in the same or is it just the mainstream of Lobos
20 Creek?

21 MS. FARRES: It's with the creek.

22 MS. BLUM: Nothing to do with the area A
23 side?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: The whole creek is area
25 A.

1 MS. BLUM: Is this connected with the
2 problems that you have with Baker Beach?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's possibly. We've
4 talked. Lobos Creek has a very complicated set of
5 issues. I'm not sure any of it's accurate, but we'll
6 know by the end. We'll start accepting what the data
7 shows.

8 MS. BLUM: Okay.

9 MS. FANELLI: Okay. I think I'm almost
10 through here.

11 Lead-based paint. We have given you all
12 the details. Suffice it to say she has been working very
13 hard with about three different consulting firms to move
14 ahead now that we have our work plan. She's making
15 really wonderful progress.

16 I can say as of day -- a day or two ago, we
17 got another closure letter. We actually have another 177
18 buildings/structures that DTSC has closed for lead-based
19 paint.

20 We have another four that we are working on
21 and she is going through the process of the remaining
22 neighborhoods. We're trying to prioritize our
23 residential neighborhoods first, but not lose sight of
24 our commercial and more industrial areas and get those
25 through.

1 The majority of them should be through with
2 our schedule by the end of calendar 2012. So we're
3 working on those.

4 Next quarter, which we are in by at least
5 half or more than half. We started our final grading --
6 we started our final grading at fillsite 1, landfill 2 so
7 you can see that activity. Planting will occur in the
8 fall after the first rains.

9 We are finalizing the RAP. It has been
10 basically finalized. I think DTSC is down to tweaking
11 words with us on it.

12 They are in control of the response
13 document. They haven't asked us for any information on
14 that, so I believe that's basically complete and should
15 come out.

16 Our remedial construction documents are
17 complete, so we're hoping to start remedial construction
18 in the next couple of weeks.

19 You will notice that we do have crews out
20 there working. They were not doing landfill E
21 remediation. They were doing a sewer relocate adjacent
22 to landfill E.

23 So if you see a contractor out there, it is
24 our contractor. We're not working on the landfill at
25 all. They're doing a sewer job between the houses on the

1 quarry and on the landfill surface. So you'll see that
2 activity, and that's what it is.

3 We're hoping that the RI for Baker Beach 1A
4 will be out and go to the Park Service for review, and
5 pending their review, we will get it out, and you guys
6 will take a look at it, as well, and our field sampling
7 plan for Baker Beach 2 we're working diligently out,
8 again with the goal of being out in August to do that
9 sampling. We'll probably have the same spider excavators
10 back.

11 MacTech has taken back the lead role for
12 the consultant for us, and AIS who did cleanup work at
13 Baker Beach 1 and 2A, is going to be doing the site
14 investigation.

15 So George Ford will be our contact. So
16 some familiar faces are going to return.

17 We're really hoping --

18 MS. BLUM: We've already paid for all that
19 equipment; right? We're not going to have to pay for
20 that equipment?

21 MS. FANELLI: We only own the spiders.

22 MS. BLUM: I thought we had to exclusively
23 contract for them. That was my recollection, that it was
24 very exclusive just for that particular job.

25 MS. FANELLI: You know, it predated me, so

1 I wasn't involved.

2 MS. BLUM: I would definitely look into
3 it. If we've been renting them --

4 MS. ANDERSON: We did sole source that
5 contract because they were the only ones that had the
6 technology to do that sort of steep slope.

7 MS. BLUM: I remember that for a very
8 short time.

9 MS. FANELLI: There are multiple companies
10 now that have spiders. MacTech did their diligence and
11 got three bids.

12 Petroleum, I'm really hoping that we have
13 the air permit. You won't see much difference. The site
14 is fenced. It will be operating as opposed to sitting
15 there.

16 We're hoping that's somewhat of a
17 formality, but lead-based paint, we're just continuing to
18 go work through and chug those out.

19 So that is it. Sam.

20 MR. BERMAN: Is there going to be a
21 summary report for all the lead-based paint work?

22 MS. FANELLI: I think you've asked that
23 before, and yes. I don't know if there'll be an actual
24 report, because DTSC will not require it, I don't
25 believe, but we will have a database with every -- just

1 like we have a tank data trust with all the information
2 about the tanks.

3 We have a closure requests. We have a copy
4 of the closure letter that goes with it. We have the
5 same thing for the lead-based paint. We have the
6 building. We have all the information we've submitted
7 about the closure of the building.

8 So the information will be available on a
9 per site building structure basis, but I don't believe it
10 will be one fat report.

11 MR. BERMAN: So we have to actually -- if
12 we want the information, we're going to have to identify
13 a site and get a master guide of lead-based paints
14 program and go through it that way and select --

15 MS. FANELLI: You can. Because we keep
16 track of a lot of this through our GIS. So if you go to
17 our GIS, and you ask information about building 42, then
18 that information should pop up.

19 That's our goal at the end of this, to have
20 it linked that way so that when we're all gone, people
21 who need that information have it available.

22 MR. BERMAN: So that's the plan.
23 Presently if I go to GIS, I won't be able to get it.

24 MS. FANELLI: The system I'm talking about
25 right now is really internal to the Trust. It's not

1 necessarily external, but I believe DTSC is posting all
2 of this, as well, on our Envirostore. It's not by
3 building. But there's not that many and they usually are
4 clumped.

5 So if you want all the Washington houses
6 it's going to be in the same report. So it's not exactly
7 as you like it, but that's what I have for now.

8 MS. BLUM: Why don't you finish with the
9 lead-based abatement on a building on the Presidio.

10 Is it likely that you will have to go back
11 again at a later time many years later and do more
12 abatement on the same building or is the abatement
13 strictly a one-time totally closed?

14 I know this was a long time ago when you
15 cited lead-based paint.

16 MS. FANELLI: So the structures themselves
17 are not necessarily abated. The Trust has chosen to
18 stabilize lead-based paint on the exterior of buildings.

19 So if we do not maintain that stabilization
20 after we clean up the lead in the soil, the Trust is
21 putting itself at risk that there is recontamination and
22 we have to go back.

23 Now that said, the Trust has started a
24 program -- and Andrea might know more about it -- as
25 houses turn over, the friction surfaces at minimum, the

1 windows are being abated.

2 So the lead paint is being removed from
3 them at a certain frequency on an annual basis, because
4 that's where most of the source for lead is.

5 That program I don't think is extended to
6 all of the painted surfaces, but they're working on the
7 ones that are most problematic, primarily from a human
8 health standpoint, not from an architecture standpoint.

9 Did I miss anything?

10 MS. ANDERSON: That's correct. The Trust
11 has a lead-based paint program, and part of the
12 lead-based paint program how they're going to review it
13 through what we call turns on the houses.

14 Obviously the time that an occupant is
15 going to be most at risk is if they're actually living in
16 the house.

17 So we try to abate a lead-based paint when
18 the houses are vacant so that we have less of an impact
19 on the residents.

20 So about 25 percent of our residences turn
21 over on an annual basis, and so we were targeting a
22 percentage of those each year to abate the friction
23 surfaces to reduce the risk to the residence.

24 MS. BLUM: So it sounds like it will be an
25 ongoing process for quite a long time.

1 MS. ANDERSON: Right. It's about a
2 twenty-year program right now. It will eventually get
3 rid of the friction surfaces within the residence.

4 MS. FANELLI: That does not address the
5 exterior paint on the sides.

6 MS. BLUM: Maintaining.

7 MS. FANELLI: In essence, we're
8 encapsulating it, keeping it stuck to the wall so that it
9 won't fall off.

10 Okay.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you, Eileen.

12 MS. FANELLI: You're welcome.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: I usually don't do a
14 lot of time-keeping, but I just want to let everybody
15 know that we've got two major additional items to go, so
16 if you don't of monitor your own questions, then I will
17 intervene.

18 We have the groundwater report on landfill
19 E's coming up, and I'm estimating thirty, 45 minutes,
20 something like that with questions.

21 Does that seem about right?

22 And then that will give -- Brian is going
23 to make a presentation, fifteen plus minutes with
24 questions. So that's kind of where we are.

25 MR. FORTUNA: As most of you know, I'm

1 John Fortuna. I'm a hydrogeologist working as an
2 environmental Consultant to the Trust, and I'm going to
3 talk about our evaluation of groundwater geochemistry
4 from samples collected from monitoring wells in and
5 around landfill E, and I encourage you guys to interrupt
6 me with questions at any time with the constraints.

7 So the objective of this evaluation was to
8 assess the quality of the groundwater and also to provide
9 a basis for development of a language term monitoring
10 program, and you -- you know this evaluation was
11 conducted in part in response to questions and concerns
12 expressed by two RAB members at previous meetings and
13 comments to the landfill E FS/RAP, and those questions
14 and concerns were sort of broadly categorized as their
15 interaction between groundwater and filters and how does
16 that affect the groundwater geochemical signature.

17 Not contaminants per se, but just the
18 general metallurgy chemistry.

19 So we did -- we took two major steps which
20 are pretty standard in geochemical contaminations. The
21 first is we actually looked at the entire data set that
22 was available from all the groundwater monitoring data
23 that's been collected in and around landfill E, and then
24 we selected one particular event, monitoring event
25 conducted in March 2006 for more detailed evaluation, and

1 we selected that for a couple of reasons.

2 One, we were looking for as comprehensive a
3 data set as we could get, meaning the most -- the most
4 wells were monitored, and also we wanted data from the
5 discharge pipe at the base of landfill E at the
6 monitoring point.

7 And so there were three or four events in
8 the data set that -- that had the data from the discharge
9 pipe and also had a pretty good comprehensive set of
10 wells, and this was the most recent.

11 We did look at more recent data from 2010
12 and other monitoring periods, but this event pretty
13 typical of what we see.

14 Once they sort of comprehensively reviewed
15 the data set and selected the event that we wanted to
16 evaluate in more detail, we used pretty standard
17 graphical techniques to look at the water chemistry. We
18 looked at diagrams and we looked at the spatial
19 distribution of water times.

20 This is really a location map to show you
21 all the points that we considered that were available.
22 In this particular data set, all of the wells were
23 monitored and the March 2006 event except for these two
24 piezometers, and as I mentioned, we did get this SPO-3
25 sample, which was the discharge, the surface water

1 drainage pipe at the landfill.

2 So this was what the distribution of water
3 chemistry looks like on a piper diagram, and what a piper
4 diagram is is it's basically a turnery clock of anions on
5 one and cations on the other side.

6 So this is calcium, magnesium, sodium and
7 potassium, which are or anions and you're looking to see
8 if there's a dominant anion or dominant cation in your
9 water signature.

10 Most of these are sort of familiar in this
11 triangle. They're not controlled by sodium which you
12 might say sodium chloride dominated where you have
13 saltwater, for example. They all kind of clot in the
14 middle.

15 When you look at this plot, you can see that
16 this is bicarbonate, and most of these samples have
17 bicarbonate cation signature.

18 This is a -- it's just a combination of the
19 diagrams, and I think I have one thing to point out. You
20 know, these -- these wells are grouped in colors that
21 we're going to get into in a little bit as to how we made
22 those groupings, but, you know, these blue and green
23 categories pretty much overlap for all the different
24 wells, and this red sample is a little bit of an outlier.

25 This has significantly more bicarbonate and

1 calcium in it than the other samples.

2 Again, this is just a general sort of broad
3 way to plot chemistry to see if you can break out the
4 strange groups, and we didn't see any real sort of
5 distinct breakouts at this level.

6 So again, these are the observations that I
7 just sort of talked about. The water times in all the
8 wells was generally pretty similar with a few
9 distinguishing characteristics. No samples had a
10 dominant cation. Although they didn't have dominant cat
11 nines. So they fall into the intermediate category.

12 They're from the perched water sample,
13 DAEGW-101, which is across that contract, and we'll show
14 them.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Just thinking about the
16 previous diagram, so those plots were from one quarter?

17 MR. FORTUNA: One event, yeah.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: One event. And were
19 they from similar, what you would call horizons or is it
20 just a mix of wherever the sample was selected?

21 MR. FORTUNA: We will get into that in the
22 coming slide when we talk about spatial contribution.

23 MR. BERMAN: Why is it that on one side
24 the percentage rises and on the other side the percentage
25 decreases? Is there any reason?

1 MR. FORTUNA: Yeah. What this shows is
2 once you move -- so we're a hundred percent calcium is
3 here and your twenty percent calcium is here.

4 So as you move this way on the diagram, you
5 have an increasing percentage of calcium, which means you
6 have correspondingly less of the other anions present in
7 the sample.

8 The next thing we did was we prepared stiff
9 diagrams for each of the -- for each of the wells, and
10 basically this is another graphical technique to look for
11 trends or groupings in groundwater geochemistry, and then
12 you plot your anions on one side and the cations on the
13 other hand, and you look at how much of these components
14 you have in your sample. It gives you sort of a distinct
15 shape.

16 You can see just looking at this sample,
17 this sample has significantly more magnesium and less
18 calcium.

19 MR. BERMAN: Is that for a given well?

20 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. Each one of those
21 stiff diagrams is going to be from one sample collected
22 in 2006, from that well. Next I'm going to show you the
23 plot for all the wells.

24 Each one of these plots is a different well
25 in and around landfill E, and the color codes were

1 determined after the fact by us based on similarities and
2 sample composition.

3 So you can see everything in blue has
4 comparatively, you know, a relatively high comment of
5 cations and anions. Usually has magnesium as a dominant
6 anion, and in general has more than the samples in green.

7 These samples generally have very high
8 anion and cation totals. They're pretty -- well, they're
9 closer to pure water, I guess is what you would say.

10 They don't have as much in them, but one of
11 the things to point out here, this is sort of a
12 continuum. So even though some of these samples have
13 lower cation and anion totals, you can see the shapes of
14 these plots are very similar.

15 This is a bicarbonate dominated water
16 sample that comes out.

17 And we'll talk about the distribution of
18 these wells, and I know you can't see the individual well
19 names right now, but that's just to show you the
20 different categories that we came up with.

21 Again, the sample in red is the DAEGW-101
22 from the perched water table, and you can see it looks a
23 little bit different than the other ones.

24 The -- the numbers that are shown here are
25 the pH of those water samples. We also wanted to look at

1 the distribution of pH in and around the landfill, and in
2 particular whether some of these samples that had a
3 higher bicarbonate content might be more alkaline and the
4 samples that might be lower content might be lower
5 alkaline. You can see that all of these samples are sort
6 of a neutral pH that are between 6 and 8.

7 There are distinct groupings between the
8 different water types. So there wasn't a discernible
9 trend in pH relative to the actual chemical content of
10 the water.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: John, is that a
12 conclusion, then, that you're making for the -- the whole
13 data set or just for this one core?

14 MR. FORTUNA: That's a good question. So
15 this is the event that we looked at in great detail, and
16 that is a conclusion that we're making for this event.

17 But what we did to test that is we went and
18 looked at some of these outliers.

19 For example, you see this pH at 6.211 of
20 the lower ones on there. What I did is went back to the
21 entire data set and looked at the pH record for that
22 well, and it turns out that that's the lowest pH
23 measurement for that well, and the average for that well
24 is about 6.6.

25 Similarly for the -- there was a high of

1 7.6 up there. That was the higher reading for that well,
2 and the average is 7.2.

3 It is for this particular data set, but we
4 did investigate that distribution a little further to
5 make sure it held up within the data record.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I asked that question
7 because in the EKI report, that did seem to make some --
8 draw a conclusion that there was higher alkalinity
9 conditions in certain parts of the landfill.

10 MR. FORTUNA: There -- there is -- you
11 know, there is higher alkalinity in the samples in blue
12 which is really a mesh of the total carbonate or
13 bicarbonate content in the water, but it's not affecting
14 the total pH.

15 MR. BERMAN: So when you go back and look
16 at all the wells, as you did in 6.2, is it a summary
17 picture of means values over years and years?

18 It would be interesting to look at the --
19 you know, to support your conclusions and have questions
20 around it for the situation.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. We did go back
22 and look at that for all the wells. I didn't plot mean
23 values here because of the variability in the data set.

24 Some of these wells have ten monitoring
25 events and some of them have two monitoring events or

1 three monitoring events.

2 So I wanted to make sure we were comparing
3 apples to apples with one event. But we can certainly
4 provide those means. The trends are the same. We did
5 calculate a mean value for every well.

6 MR. BERMAN: So you can do an analysis of
7 that and ask is there a salinity difference among them?

8 So the answer is yes. The significant
9 level may be reduced because you only have a couple
10 samples. The others you have many samples.

11 It seems to me you could do that analysis
12 and then have a quantitative statement on your somewhat
13 qualitative conclusion.

14 MR. FORTUNA: And I think it would make a
15 lot of sense to take that third step, which is the
16 standard third step in geochemical analysis to do the
17 statistics if we saw anything in these trends that
18 warranted that, but we don't see any wells here that are
19 routinely or ever at a pH of 8.5 or 9 and we don't have
20 any pH five wells.

21 So there's nothing outside of a neutral
22 range of six to eight that would -- I guess what I'm
23 saying is it's not particularly material whether a sample
24 has an average of pH 6.4 or pH 6.9. Those are near
25 neutral pH's and they mean the same thing.

1 So there's no outliers in the data set that
2 have higher or lower ph's that would drive up to do that
3 next step of the evaluation.

4 But you're right. You could pin that down
5 in more detail if you wanted to.

6 So our conclusions from looking at these
7 stiff diagram. You know, they said all of the water
8 samples are classified at intermedial groundwaters, but
9 within -- within that category, there's three distinct
10 subtypes.

11 There was the magnesium carbonate
12 intermediate groundwaters which are shown in blue. The
13 dilute intermediate waters, which were shown in green,
14 and the calcium carbonate water, which was the perched
15 water, and that was the only one with that signature.

16 We didn't find a discernible pattern with
17 the pH.

18 Again, this was just the illustration of
19 the three different types of intermediate groundwaters we
20 encountered.

21 So this map was really interesting. It
22 shows the spatial distribution of these groundwater
23 sites. It does not take into account where these
24 individual wells were screened, what the formation is.

25 This was just the planned view distribution

1 of these groundwater types, and, you know, the axis of
2 the pre-landfill value is somewhere down in here through
3 the middle of -- approximate middle of the landfill, and
4 I think it's pretty clear from this map that, you know,
5 all the wells sort of to the south and west of the
6 landfill have this sort of dilute signature, including
7 the sample from the terra cotta pipe exiting the toe of
8 the landfill, which is probably the most reminiscent of
9 surface water, while the sample on the eastern side have
10 the higher alkalinity, higher magnesium content.

11 This is -- the next slide is -- this is a
12 cross-section through the landfill and it runs
13 essentially down the axis of the landfill, but some of
14 those wells are sort of projected on to this.

15 And this is what it looks like in cross-
16 section. This is the contact between fill material and
17 the native colma formation, and you can see the red stiff
18 diagram, the well has a significantly different
19 signature, but we don't see it either in the shallow
20 wells downgradient from that well or in the well stream
21 of colma formation below the landfill.

22 So, you know, there's different
23 interpretations I think for why we have this
24 distribution, why we have different levels on the east
25 than on the west, and, you know, if you look at the

1 dilute groundwater type shown in green, they're very
2 similar composition to the discharge coming out of that
3 pipe at the toe of the landfill, which is representative,
4 and that leads us to believe that wells screened on the
5 western side of the landfill, the groundwater entering
6 those wells has had little interaction with bedrock.

7 It's really -- appears to be infiltration
8 into groundwater traveling to those wells.

9 Where the best explanation for the
10 different chemistry on the eastern side of the landfill
11 is that those groundwaters have longer travel times and
12 longer interaction with bedrock and a greater chance at
13 dissolved carbonate minerals and pick up alkalinity as
14 they move through the formations at that rate.

15 That's how I would interpret that data
16 based on what we've reviewed.

17 In all cases, the water quality types are
18 very similar. Even though some groundwaters have many
19 more cat than anions and the dilute groundwaters, they're
20 compositionally the same, which speaks to the buffering
21 formation in the rocks materials.

22 There is influence from the waste in the
23 perched water table and it results in a signature that's
24 different than the rest of the groundwater geochemically
25 and clearly that's likely interaction with the fill

1 material, but we don't see that influence in wells
2 downgradient or deeper in similar locations in the
3 landfill.

4 MR. BERMAN: So --

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Go ahead, Sam.

6 MR. BERMAN: Is this a conclusion that --
7 an observation. Does that confirm the previous
8 considerations or is this different new? I don't
9 remember.

10 MR. FORTUNA: I'm not sure in what regard
11 you mean.

12 I think the -- the previous question
13 centered on the degree of interaction between groundwater
14 and fill material and was that a concern and how would
15 the remedy address that.

16 And I think what we can say is that
17 clearly, you know, the perched water, when it's present
18 in the fill material, is interacting with fill.

19 It doesn't seem to be a concern. We're not
20 seeing that signature downgradient or deeper, but it is
21 happening.

22 When -- again, when we get that perched
23 water during the really rainy period, we think the
24 proposed remedy will help it to get that.

25 I don't believe the difference in water

1 chemistry signature on opposite sides of the landfill is
2 a reflection of infiltration processes or interaction
3 with waste and I don't think it will likely change based
4 on the remedy. I think that's based on the amount of
5 interaction with bedrock.

6 You know, what this -- this does speak a
7 little bit to the monitoring program, and it would be
8 good to have a long-term monitoring program that looks
9 at, you know -- typically at the toe of the landfill, you
10 would design one monitoring well that's downgradient of
11 flow.

12 It might be useful to have two, one on
13 either side of the toe to look at these two different
14 chemistries to see how they change over time, but I don't
15 expect it to change based on --

16 MR. BERMAN: So one is concluding that
17 evidence is there's little or no interaction between
18 waste materials and the groundwater?

19 MR. FORTUNA: I think the perched water
20 table well would say there is interaction between perched
21 groundwater.

22 MR. BERMAN: Perched, yes important.

23 MR. FORTUNA: But based on the remainder
24 of the water chemistry, there's no evidence that that
25 interaction is having an influence on groundwater.

1 MR. BERMAN: And would you also conclude
2 that when the remedy is employed, that there isn't going
3 to be any substantial amount of perched water?

4 MS. FANELLI: That's certainly our hope.

5 MR. FORTUNA: My intention has been all
6 along, as I've said in previous meetings, that we think
7 the bulk of the source of the perched water is the broken
8 terra cotta pipe, the ponded water at the landfill and
9 other direct sources of surface water that's charged to
10 groundwater, and those will be mitigated during the
11 routing.

12 So I -- yes, our hope is that that will
13 take care of the perched water table. I think that that
14 will happen based on all the evidence that I've reviewed.

15 MR. BERMAN: I think it's really a good
16 idea to look at two wells on both sides. You've got a
17 reasonably good principle of explaining the difference in
18 the chemistry, but you're not having any long time period
19 to substantiate that.

20 So that sounds like a really good idea for
21 people to have really understood the cause of the
22 chemistry.

23 MR. FORTUNA: Just to point out, we did
24 plot stiff diagrams and look at the spatial distribution
25 for the last event in 2010, as well, but it's not as many

1 wells.

2 It's not as comprehensive, so I didn't
3 present it, but it is the same distribution with the
4 dilute water on one side and the magnesium carbonate on
5 the other side.

6 MR. BERMAN: Thank you.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm wondering, this --
8 I really appreciate all the work you've done with this.
9 I'm wondering with your observation that it's on the
10 eastern side, it's a certain groundwater type based on
11 influence with bedrock and not the waste.

12 Did you check that against, say, some of
13 the other wells in the Tennessee Hollow area to see if
14 similar wells at -- at -- in the bedrock, you know, kind
15 of test your hypothesis there against other wells?

16 I mention that only because early maps that
17 showed these stiff diagrams indicated a pattern of
18 landfill E that wasn't -- it was dissimilar to outside
19 landfill E.

20 MR. FORTUNA: The answer to that is no, we
21 didn't look a great distance upgradient or downgradient
22 from Tennessee Hollow, and part of the reason is just the
23 revolution of the data.

24 I mean, ideally if you look at -- if you
25 look at this distribution, what we really want to have is

1 a couple wells up here, and also downgradient to be able
2 to sort of test this further, but we don't, and, you
3 know, the wells that are present are a significant
4 distance upgradient, and there's not enough resolution in
5 the local geologic maps to know if that mirrors the
6 condition of present landfill E.

7 You know, to speculate, it's likely that
8 water falling here is infiltrating right through the
9 colma sands and showing up in these wells and water
10 coming in this way has more interaction with bedrock, but
11 we don't have -- we don't have a good -- we don't have
12 good well location and geologic resolution to test that
13 further.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: One of my concerns --
15 and I put this in many comments -- was if you have
16 rainwater with acidic conditions, pH, over time, that
17 that could dissolve out condition, you know, minerals
18 that are producing alkaline conditions if this were a
19 result of interaction with the waste, and that was a
20 concern about having just the earth cover versus more
21 protection.

22 So do you feel like the risk -- I mean,
23 that some day if we -- if we're not monitoring this
24 closely, my feeling is that that eventually -- if -- if
25 it were due to rainwater passing through waste materials

1 and eventually those minerals washed out of the landfill,
2 that then you could have acidic conditions in the fill
3 material which could dissolve half the metals and would
4 we be able to catch that before we had trouble
5 downgradient that would be almost irreversible at that
6 point and hugely expensive to deal with.

7 I'm just looking at the risk management
8 decision.

9 MR. FORTUNA: You know, I don't know if
10 I'm prepared to comment on how that process might change
11 over time.

12 You know, if you look at GW-101, based on
13 conditions in that terra cotta pipe, we've been dumping
14 who knows how much water through those breaks in the
15 landfill for a long time, and clearly there's some
16 calcium carbon buffering going on, and I'm sure that
17 there's substantially what you're going to get through
18 the engineer cover.

19 So in terms of the process, I would think
20 you'd be talking about a long, long way in the future.

21 But I think really what your question
22 speaks to is you need to design appropriate a detection
23 monitoring program to look for those sort of things, and
24 the Trust is committed to doing that.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: And given that that is

1 a possibility, even though it may be remote, do we know
2 whether that may be included in the RAP that this
3 monitoring be expended out indefinitely?

4 There's a tendency to reduce monitoring
5 over time or we're not seeing problems. Therefore, we'll
6 cut back on monitoring.

7 It's just another case of if we don't
8 monitor this and it were to change conditions and metals
9 leach out, it would ruin all the downstream restoration
10 that we're doing, potentially.

11 So I know you don't have an answer, but I'm
12 just responding. I really appreciate what you've done.

13 MR. FORTUNA: Any other questions?

14 Okay.

15 MR. BERMAN: Can I just follow up on my
16 understanding?

17 In the remediation, what -- is there a time
18 period given the groundwater monitoring?

19 MS. FANELLI: I believe we monitor at the
20 direction of DTSC and it's always designed to be at least
21 a thirty-year monitoring horizon, and there's five-year
22 reviews, ad nauseam. I think there's no sunset clause to
23 them as long as DTSC requires them.

24 I know the Trust is prepared to be
25 monitoring the site and all of our caps in the long-term,

1 and that was the risk decision that was made.

2 At 10, at 9, at 8, at 5 and at E because we
3 have a capped fillsite. I'm going to pull my stick out
4 over there.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you, John.

6 MS. BLUM: Do you believe there will be a
7 remediation department at the Trust, and that the
8 remediation work at the Trust is closed?

9 MS. FANELLI: I don't think there will be
10 a remediation department, but there will certainly be a
11 group of people that are responsible for maintaining and
12 monitoring the sites.

13 I don't know what department that will be,
14 but the Trust has to do that. They've committed to doing
15 it.

16 MS. BLUM: And they would be required to
17 submit these monitoring reports to the agency?

18 MS. FANELLI: Right. They'd be submitted
19 at this point to DTSC, and if the Water Board requested
20 them, they'd be submitted to the Water Board, as well.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Here we go. Sara wanted
22 me to talk about some of the sites, so here it is. It's
23 pretty informal, so if you have questions, just interrupt
24 me.

25 So this is just a listing of all the sites

1 that are remaining in the process. There's a number that
2 we've talked about over the years that have been worked
3 on, they've been resolved. We have administrative
4 closure processes.

5 I haven't included those. These are the
6 ones that are upcoming. I'll just let you go through
7 that. We'll go through them all tonight just for the
8 people to be familiar.

9 We don't talk about this too much. This
10 shows division between area A and area B. The Park
11 Service administers area A, the Trust administers area B.
12 The Trust is responsible for the waste in both areas.

13 I've highlighted the areas we'll talk about
14 tonight in area A.

15 One thing I do want to point out, as Eileen
16 mentioned earlier, Crissy Field, the site there that we
17 talked about oh so many years ago are now off the table.
18 They're done.

19 So probably the next site that's going to
20 be cleaned up in area B, CHP pistol range. The toll
21 plaza for the bridge is right here. This is an area that
22 we call Battery East, which is one of the historic
23 batteries that existed prior to the building of the
24 Golden Gate Bridge.

25 It's a little bit of hard to see, but the

1 firing range was actually shooting into the side of a
2 historic magazine and into the historic fabric.

3 It is operated from 1944 to 1964 as a
4 firing range. As I said, it was constructed on top of
5 the historic fabric.

6 The Trust has prepared a design and work
7 plan for the cleanup. Both the Department of Toxic
8 Substances are reviewing that now, and they're planning
9 and working toward construction at the end of the summer.

10 We have a couple concerns. We seem to be
11 working through those fine. One is we just want to make
12 sure that the cultural resources are there and protected
13 during the process, and as we'll pick up on a number of
14 times tonight, there's a lot of things going on at the
15 Golden Gate Bridge.

16 Many of them for the preparation for the
17 75th anniversary of the bridge. As we go around the bend
18 to the Baker Beach area, it's a critical part of the work
19 that we're working on to try to bring up to the level
20 that it deserves. So we'll show you that.

21 Moving around now to the west, so this is
22 above the Baker Beach or the Marshall Beach area, as some
23 people call it.

24 So you can see the toll plaza here at the
25 top. We've had two major sites cleaned up there. Baker

1 Beach disturbed area 1 and 2A. There are two remaining
2 sites in this area.

3 Starting at the bottom, disturbed area 2.
4 Eileen mentioned that earlier tonight. Baker Beach
5 disturbed area 1A. Eileen mentioned that earlier
6 tonight, and the Merchant Road fill site.

7 I will point out Merchant Road is a unknown
8 site. It has a little different relationship between the
9 Army and the Trust and is an unknown site.

10 MS. BLUM: Could you point out where the
11 parking lot is on Merchant Road?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I apologize. This aerial
13 was from before the parking lot was constructed. So
14 Merchant Road has been realigned and now comes through
15 here and the parking lot is here.

16 These are the existing trailer type
17 buildings with the Golden Gate Bridge administrative
18 offices and this is battery Marcus Miller, I believe, and
19 if you were to walk along the trail here as you're
20 walking north, the ground level would be higher on your
21 right, and that's primarily a result of the fill that was
22 put in that area.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Could you explain that
24 photo?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is actually Baker

1 Beach disturbed area 1. Not so much to show you the
2 site, but to show you the nature of this area, and this
3 is the highlight of wonderful trail system with overlooks
4 that is just at the beginning of its work. Beautiful
5 vistas of the bridge.

6 Any of you that walked out there would see
7 just beautiful lands that exist out there, and these
8 three sites all have a relationship to our construction
9 and trail. The trail goes through areas that are
10 currently thought to be contaminated.

11 And so there's a timing issue as we work
12 through cleanup and trail construction.

13 MR. ROTH: What Brian talked about, you
14 may have heard about the trail initiative in the parks.
15 We've been working on it for sometime.

16 One of our signatures from this project is
17 the Presidio coastal trail that will start in this area.
18 They've been working on that all along in the Presidio
19 actually to Baker Beach and beyond, and we have several
20 different projects taking place in this area.

21 Right now it's quite a bit mixed up. It's
22 hard to navigate. It's confusing, and we're really
23 excited about some of the improvements that we'll be
24 breaking ground on soon, next few weeks around this area.

25 That being said, we weren't able to move

1 forward with the project as it was originally scoped even
2 though we had the funding for it because we had to avoid
3 areas that were thought -- some of these areas are
4 thought to be in need of remediation.

5 So we're doing some disconnected segments
6 that we're doing with the trail with the hope to return
7 shortly to complete the whole alignment.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: So to summarize some of
9 that, we have three remediation sites in this area.
10 They're intertwined with the planned anticipated overlook
11 trails in the stewardship that we'll be using in this
12 area.

13 So the status. Eileen mentioned that
14 there's additional sampling the Trust wants to do in
15 Baker Beach disturbed area 2, and at the same time, we'll
16 be working out there in August.

17 The trail work. Areas that are free from
18 contamination will begin.

19 So we have a couple things that are going
20 on at this point. In this general area, primarily with
21 respect to Baker Beach disturbed area 1A.

22 The Trust has proposed revision for major
23 contamination at the site, as well as a discussion of
24 the -- of new background levels for the same time.

25 We've also experienced a delay in

1 feasibility of 1A by about seven months since last
2 August.

3 We have a couple concerns at this time. As
4 he was saying, we're really excited about the trail work
5 and we really want to get going with that.

6 The Trust has brought up these issues with
7 respect to the cleanup levels. The cancer potency
8 values, the previous exposure assumptions for visitors in
9 that area, whether the background levels reflect urban
10 conditions are irrelevant or not.

11 We're working through these discussions,
12 which are very similar to the discussions we had in 2002.
13 We're going back and revisiting that process, as we had
14 unnecessary delay as we move forward.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you happen to have
16 the visual that shows like the proposed trail and the
17 current outlines of contamination so we could --

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: I didn't have one that
19 was very reflective, but if that's something you'd like
20 to see, I can certainly bring one next time.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems like one of
22 the questions that's coming in my mind are how big are
23 the contamination areas compared to the total trail and
24 what -- you know, is the contamination covering the whole
25 trail?

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: The contamination is
2 wide.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: And at Baker Beach 1A, if
5 I can -- the contamination is material from on top of the
6 concrete structures that were there and a combination of
7 both the Army removing the roofing material and placing
8 it out to the west of the structures and presumably
9 erosion or somehow migration from the road.

10 Contaminants exist from the concrete out to
11 about the edge of the frontal slope, which is a very
12 broad area, and if you were to walk out there in the edge
13 of the frontal slope where the change of slope and the
14 cliff happens, so -- it drops off fairly steeply from
15 that point.

16 So if you were to make a trail through that
17 frontal slope, you would be going through some of the
18 areas that does have roofing contamination in it.

19 And the condition of the fillsite are
20 different. It's a whole different mechanism for how
21 contamination is out there, but it's generally the area
22 from what we call Bowman Road, which is the covered way
23 behind or in front, depending on which way you're viewing
24 from the battery all the way to and including underneath
25 the new Merchant Road parking lot.

1 So it would be hard to get a trail through
2 there without encountering contamination.

3 MS. BLUM: Brian?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes, Jan.

5 MS. BLUM: On this page, the page 2 of
6 this slide, the Park Service park, the Trust has raised
7 concern about the cleanup level for PAHs.

8 Does that mean that they want them raised
9 or the cleanup, they want a level cleanup?

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: They would like the
11 number to be higher which would be --

12 MS. BLUM: Lowering the standard.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Making the standard less
14 protective.

15 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's very confusing when
17 you say lower or higher.

18 MS. FANELLI: I don't think the Trust
19 would characterize it that way, but, you know, please
20 continue the conversation since we're not aware that this
21 was the topic today.

22 MS. BLUM: Apparently it is a topic for
23 discussion and has delayed the process by seven months,
24 so it is something to discuss.

25 MS. FANELLI: I'm not saying it's nothing

1 to discuss. We weren't prepared that this was the Park
2 Service was presenting.

3 So I just can't respond, but I can assure
4 you there's a different -- we might have a different --
5 characterize the process differently.

6 MS. KRAMER: I just wanted some
7 clarification about the third bullet under --

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Background?

9 MS. KRAMER: Right, background values are
10 not set to reflect urban conditions.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Under the current
12 sampling document, there essentially is no background
13 level of pH's.

14 pH's are a very, almost ubiquitous
15 compounds. They come from a lot of different combustion
16 sources. They also come from coal tar.

17 It's very likely that the roofing material
18 here was made from coal tar and that's the source of the
19 pH's.

20 Our position has been that if you look at
21 the sampling data, you can get to very low levels of the
22 edge of where we see the contamination. The background
23 of this site is very low or near none.

24 MS. KRAMER: Mm-hmm.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Trust has brought up

1 discussions with us which suggest that an urban study,
2 studies of urban areas might be more appropriate and that
3 there is a background level and that that level is
4 actually above the current cleanup level for residential
5 or unrestricted use, and that's our difference of
6 opinion.

7 MS. KRAMER: Mm-hmm.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: It does make a difference
9 if the background is above or higher than the cleanup
10 level, we've never -- no one from the Presidio has ever
11 advocated cleaning up below background. You would be
12 digging up a lot more than you need to.

13 MS. SEGAL: Before you go on, I want to
14 discuss that part. I had a quick question which might be
15 totally off topic.

16 Because you showed a slide of the beautiful
17 Bay Area and thinking about the America's Cup which is
18 coming soon, I'm wondering what the Park Service is doing
19 in terms of the number of visitors. I don't know if it's
20 going to go under the gate or not.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: We are working with the
22 City of San Francisco and have a group within the park
23 that is working to try to manage the potential impacts
24 and work with the City so we have a very productive
25 question.

1 MS. SEGAL: We're working with the City,
2 then.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: We understand that
4 there's going to be a number of activities over the next
5 several years that are going to bring people to the
6 coastal areas, both for the ocean viewing folks and the
7 bay viewing folks.

8 The America's Cup, the Golden Gate Bridge
9 anniversary, a number of things. So it's going to be a
10 very --

11 MS. SEGAL: When is that? The 16th?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: The anniversary's in
13 2012.

14 MR. ROTH: The cleanup won't be in time
15 for that, obviously, and we're going to start soon after.
16 We can talk about it later. The cleanup will be after
17 that.

18 You know, they cut the ribbon on the 75th,
19 we'll be digging in the next day.

20 MS. FANELLI: Right.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: I have occasionally
22 asked about the Merchant Road fillsite because I actually
23 went out there several times when we were looking at and
24 I actually helped develop the sample spot and things, and
25 I've occasionally asked about the situation with the data

1 and what's going on.

2 Is this part of that issue or are we
3 talking about talking pH's?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: We are talking about
5 background levels, pH's. There's been a lot of
6 discussions that I was present at several months ago for
7 Merchant Road site. That was the discussion.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I also recall hearing
9 of lead, dioxin, things -- no. Something that was
10 blowing off the --

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Elevated silver and
12 dioxin that appear to be from the incinerator.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: And is that also under
14 discussion?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not -- we haven't had
16 many recent discussions, so --

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: So that -- that's the big
19 work that we're doing right now at the Trust to kind of
20 see where the major discussions are.

21 I just want to go over the rest and
22 highlight them. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on
23 it. We still have time, so if someone wants to talk
24 about them, that's fine.

25 Again, we have a map showing you where all

1 these sites are currently going on and that's just a
2 pretty picture of Baker Beach.

3 Lead-based paint in soil in area A. Eileen
4 went through the program. We do have a few areas where
5 the Trust is responsible for sampling for doing the
6 remediation. I count fourteen.

7 The Trust is part of the program to make
8 sure that the building, the paint is stable so they don't
9 immediately find a problem.

10 They've asked us to address the paint on
11 six of the buildings and we're making arrangements.

12 For buildings 970, 971, that's a petroleum
13 site. That's a former site of a about a hundred
14 thousand, just above Long Avenue. We're having
15 discussions with the Trust as to what the appropriate
16 level of justification for their proposal to leave the
17 remaining contamination in place. There's a small area
18 that is above the cleanup levels.

19 We've talked a lot over the last few years
20 about the Public Health Service Hospital area. Two of
21 them cross into area A.

22 I don't think there's anything new to
23 report there. We're waiting and looking forward to
24 seeing the completion report for that.

25 Something we haven't talked about here

1 because this is not Presidio Trust project. This is the
2 Golden Gate Bridge District. Many of you may have
3 recognized over the years, and I think the Bridge
4 District did send representatives here six or seven years
5 ago.

6 The bridge was originally painted with
7 lead-based paint. At different times in the maintenance
8 process, they sandblasted that off, and in the time frame
9 that they did that, they had much less control than they
10 would today.

11 So there was a significant amount of
12 lead-based paint, flakes that came down from their
13 operation.

14 They're both on the Marin side and on the
15 Presidio side. It's a little bit different because the
16 paint they were using was a little bit different. They
17 have both lead and zinc, and in Marin, it's just lead.

18 The Bridge District has done some cleanup
19 in the areas that were impacted and impacting their
20 seismic work where they had workers. They had to clean
21 up for workers' safety.

22 They've now moved on to the area beyond
23 that immediately below the bridge. They're doing a
24 feasibility study. They've had one meeting with us and
25 kicked that process off. So we're still early in that

1 process.

2 We're interested in making sure that what
3 they do, both in planning and implementing the remedies
4 is respectful of natural cultural resources that are in
5 the area.

6 We also expect that we will have
7 discussions regarding the cleanup level for the work that
8 they're going to do.

9 MR. ROTH: It's potentially a broad part
10 of that area.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a very large amount
12 of land that is potentially impacted by the bridge. If
13 we were to -- so the bridge is up here. The lead extends
14 to about somewhere in this area, and then on the Presidio
15 side, it's almost exclusive to east of the roadway.

16 There is little to none west of the
17 roadway, and that's because the way the prevailing winds
18 are.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: And the Bridge District
20 is different from Caltrans?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. The Bridge
22 District --

23 FACILITATOR KERN: We have Caltrans
24 cleanup levels from when they've done the cleanup.

25 And so the Bridge District wants to do a

1 different cleanup?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes, and they have
3 proposed for their feasibility, they do a cleanup level,
4 I believe it's 1368, and in this area, the Presidio
5 cleanup levels is 160.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: 160 versus 1368?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. The cleanup level
8 for the pistol range is 160. So that's why I'm
9 anticipating that we'll have discussions about that.

10 MR. BERMAN: Does this sound like a
11 difficult number to resolve? The numbers seem very
12 disparate.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is a very large area
14 to clean up. Cleaning up to 160 would be very impactful.
15 It's not even clear that it would be feasible for that
16 whole area.

17 So I'm pointing out right now we're at
18 different places that we're talking about, but that's
19 part of what a feasibility study would do, is looking at
20 the impact and what you would achieve at different ways
21 of doing the work, and that's a discussion that we're
22 looking forward to having.

23 MR. BERMAN: Let's say that your high
24 level turned out to be -- a decision was to allow the
25 higher level.

1 Does that mean that there would be -- that
2 it is a danger for people that trespass in that area?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: That will be one of the
4 things that the state will make a determination on. This
5 is being overseen by the Department of Toxic Substances
6 Control.

7 Just like any of the Presidio remedies,
8 they will put forward one that is protecting. And so
9 what that exactly means is what will be worked out in
10 detail.

11 Presumably they would not allow a remedy
12 that would allow the incidental visitor to the park not
13 to be harmed.

14 MR. BERMAN: Right. That could be meaning
15 fencing the area totally so it's inaccessible.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: That typically is one of
17 the remedies. That's not something the Park Service
18 endorses. We like the parks to be open. So we don't
19 really -- we're not really tolerant for remedies that
20 close it.

21 The 160 number is also based on an
22 environmental risk and a fence would not keep plants and
23 animals out of there.

24 MR. BERMAN: With the disparate numbers
25 and the decision that would impact the environmental

1 morphology of the area, this sounds like a rather
2 difficult problem.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it will be. It's
4 not -- if it were simple, we'd have it done by now. It
5 will be challenging to have that discussion.

6 MR. BERMAN: And who has the final
7 authority? DTSC?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: DTSC.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Has there been sampling
10 in that area of concern?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: There has been.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you have a feel for
13 what kind of numbers those were?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I do. It's a complicated
15 map. The numbers are generally in the thousands. I have
16 seen instances of over 20,000.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: So even at the number
19 that the Bridge District is proposing, they do have
20 significant area above that number.

21 Jan.

22 MS. BLUM: I'm having a difficult time
23 understanding if DTSC is the agency who rules protective
24 or not protective or what work is needed and why the
25 process is stuck.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not saying it is
2 stuck.

3 MS. BLUM: Okay.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm saying there's a
5 discussion.

6 MS. BLUM: Delayed.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's moving on. There's
8 going to be a fairly energetic discussion, and so we're
9 just pointing out to you saying that's one of the things
10 we're going to be talking with the Bridge District and
11 the state to advocate a number that will be protective.

12 MR. ROTH: Jan is talking about the trail.

13 MS. BLUM: Plus others. The question is:
14 Will the remediation be finished in a timely way?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm hopeful that we can
16 have those discussions. That's what we'd like to see,
17 and that's for the pH's.

18 We believe that what we've done in 2002 is
19 a good basis to keep moving forward, and that the --
20 there isn't any significant information now that compels
21 us to revisit that and that the potential harm for the
22 timing is -- makes it such that we should keep moving
23 forward with what we're already decided.

24 I don't remember if you were on the RAB
25 when we went through that. It was well over a year. All

1 of the stakeholders worked together to get those cleanup
2 levels as they were, and there were tradeoffs and
3 compromises made in that process, and if we start opening
4 up for one, there may be others that we need to open up
5 for, as well, and it could take sometime to resolve that.

6 I think it could take as long as it did the
7 first time, and that is -- is that the best way to move
8 forward? And we're saying it should move forward with
9 what we have.

10 MR. BERMAN: If DTSC should rule for a
11 lower -- something in the vicinity of a lower cleanup
12 number, who has the -- who is financially responsible for
13 getting to that level?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: For the Bridge District?

15 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Bridge District is
17 actively working with the state and taking -- taking the
18 responsibility.

19 MR. BERMAN: So that's when the tolls go
20 up to \$20.00.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: The tolls pay for
22 everything.

23 We have three other sites that we haven't
24 talked about night. Lobos Creek, the slag dump site and
25 the battery frontal slopes, and right now we don't expect

1 that additional sampling.

2 Of those three, the last two are unknown
3 sites. The first is a known site. We talked a bit about
4 that -- one of Jan's questions earlier, and right now our
5 concern is really we're not moving forward on them, but
6 there's no -- we're not working on them, and I just
7 wanted to be complete at tonight's discussion.

8 MS. SEGAL: Where is that dump site? Can
9 you show us on the map?

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can. So the slag dump
11 site is down here. So Baker Beach, this part. This is
12 that broad rough plain in through here.

13 There's a series of vegetated dunes in
14 there, and one of our natural resource folks noted one
15 day that one of the dunes was different than the others.

16 Plants were different, and what our natural
17 resource folks have figured out is that if plants are
18 different, there's usually a rain, and on closer
19 inspection, it appears that that dune has a lot of
20 incinerator slag or metal slag, cinders of some sort.

21 At that point, it was a new discovery.
22 Under the terms of our agreements with the Trust and the
23 Army, we notified the Trust of that. That was a number
24 of years ago, and to my knowledge, the site hasn't been
25 sampled yet. So it's a potential site.

1 MS. SEGAL: Was there an incinerator at
2 that site?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not that we know of. We
4 don't know much about it. It's a dune. We don't know if
5 it's intruding on top of the sand dune or it's a pile
6 that had no dunes.

7 MS. SEGAL: Are those buildings just below
8 the trail on here?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: In here? This is one of
10 the batteries.

11 MS. SEGAL: Thanks.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: So if you go through that
13 area, this is the parking lot and then you can walk
14 behind the magazine, the batteries here and then the
15 beach and you're walking on the beach to get there.

16 I'm sure anyone -- most of the people don't
17 notice that there's something around there. It's a
18 subtle vegetation change that our folks picked up.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: On the slide before
20 this, I made a note, if we could go back to that.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: This one?

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. Tell us about
23 the conditions. The other two bullets, "existing cancer
24 potential values may not be appropriate."

25 What does that mean?

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I understand that the
2 Trust has said that there are new numbers or new studies
3 that go into setting the slope factor, and as part of the
4 equation for determining cancer risk, they are saying
5 that the new slope factors should be used instead of the
6 slope factors that were used for the 2002 areas that we
7 have, and those numbers -- if that were the only change,
8 it changes the cleanup number by approximately -- a
9 factor of four.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: The previous exposure
11 assumptions for visitors may not be appropriate, what
12 does that mean?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Trust has said that
14 the investors that will use that site in the future, the
15 assumptions that went into the calculation of how much a
16 maximum exposed individual would have using that site and
17 that their model will be someone that transverses the
18 site once, and we have said that that may not be the most
19 exposed individual, and there are people who go there to
20 contemplate the view and spend significant time there,
21 people who watch birds, sit on the ground, things like
22 that.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: As you recall, there's a
25 number of different factors that go into exposure

1 assumptions. You get into the nitty gritty details of
2 whether people wear long sleeve shirts, short sleeve
3 shirts, all those different things.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: This is a similar
5 conversation to the selenium discussion that we had, but
6 this is for people, not animals?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is for people.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Maybe we can review the
9 equation and what's being proposed.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was -- I believe
11 that was my last slide.

12 MR. BERMAN: Just to follow up in the
13 waning minutes, the bullet number 1, 2 and 3 all would
14 change the -- the levels to -- the appropriate levels all
15 would be changed to higher values, right?

16 All three of those -- under those bullets,
17 would it be ever reduce the --

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Our understanding with
19 what the Trust has proposed is that their changes to
20 these numbers would make the cleanup levels higher.

21 You could change these in ways that don't
22 change the cleanup level significantly or otherwise make
23 them even more -- make them lower. If you were to say
24 that people spend a significant amount of time, more than
25 we modeled at 2002 at the site, you could change this and

1 make the level go down.

2 MR. BERMAN: You could, but it seems to me
3 that the underlying momentum here in those people is
4 always make the cleanup levels higher.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was our perception,
6 too.

7 And so I take it your concern is really
8 well appreciated, because the three taken together would
9 significantly raise the cleanup levels over a wide area
10 of concerns.

11 Well -- and we started the discussion in
12 respect to Baker Beach disturbed area 1A. Ph's are
13 common a number of sites.

14 So one of the implications -- we haven't
15 done that exercise to see where else it applies.

16 MR. BERMAN: From your exposition here, it
17 seems to me in terms of -- of doing health concerns, this
18 is the largest concern coming out of anything in the
19 remediation process, because it really directly impacts
20 humans and it's sensitive to assumptions that you make
21 and it's all -- you know, all about human effects here,
22 and therefore this is -- of anything.

23 I mean, as a public member of RAB, this is
24 a concern that one might think the appropriate direction
25 is to be conservative, whereas as you answered my

1 previous question, the momentum is just the opposite
2 direction.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: Your first part of your
4 question, pH's are -- when you work through the risk
5 factors, the studies have shown that they're more
6 problematic for humans than they were for ecological
7 receptors.

8 Unlike many of the things we've dealt with
9 over this program where they are similar or ecological
10 ones are more sensitive.

11 This is one of the ones that I think -- one
12 of the few that we really deal with where it's driven by
13 human health.

14 MR. BERMAN: Yes. I'm just reiterating
15 that you accurately stated it. That's a major concern
16 and kind of responsible for RAB people here who are --
17 want to see whatever remediation process, that it doesn't
18 undermine human health considerations.

19 So it sort of sets an alarm bell off when
20 the totality of all those people is actually the cleanup
21 levels.

22 MR. ROTH: Our perception is that no -- it
23 wouldn't be a risk to human health, per se. I think
24 there's more a concern about -- that's not our perception
25 from what we've seen.

1 It's more around the time needed to
2 incorporate perhaps the new data or revise the process
3 and make it an active site, if that makes sense.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: And I think what Aaron is
5 saying is that it may take a lot of time because it is
6 sensitive because it's human health, and we share that
7 concern.

8 MR. ROTH: Right.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: You know, so many things
10 can always be improved, but we have a system that we work
11 long and hard on to get to a point and now we'd like to
12 see it used and don't really see the direct benefit of
13 re-energizing that discussion that has been quiet for so
14 long.

15 MS. KRAMER: Is that going to be resolved
16 or determined at a certain point or -- I mean, whether
17 this is changing. Is there a timeline or something on
18 that when, you know, more data will come out and a
19 proposal will be made or is it sort of going on?

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Trust has proposals
21 in. It would be the background levels.

22 Is that correct, Eileen? You currently
23 have a proposal on the table.

24 MS. FANELLI: We don't have a proposed
25 background level, no, we don't.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: But you have a background
2 level.

3 MS. FANELLI: We have provided a
4 methodology to DTSC And asked for their guidance and the
5 Water Board, they're both copied, on establishing a
6 background for PAH, because as Brian correctly pointed
7 out, there is not a background established in the cleanup
8 level document, and in addition to the PAH, we have
9 select metals that do not have an established background
10 or the background that's established is basically a
11 detection limit.

12 It's not -- there wasn't even enough data
13 when it was originally established back in 2002 that are
14 problematic on sites.

15 And so we have proposed to DTSC a
16 methodology and said if you wanted to look at
17 backgrounds, this is the method that we propose to follow
18 and are asking for their comment and guidance on that
19 methodology.

20 MS. KRAMER: So there isn't some like
21 standard in the country that --

22 MS. FANELLI: Or methodology?

23 MS. KRAMER: And levels cleanup.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: There is no national
25 level that directly applies here. There's many things

1 that can be used.

2 The number that EPA currently uses is the
3 one that we used in 2002, although they are in the
4 process of revising that number.

5 The number that sort of has -- or the
6 number that the Trust is using is the one that the State
7 of California has used for drinking water as a proposed
8 basis for a potential revision to the drinking water
9 standards.

10 Other countries have other numbers. There
11 are only a few underlined studies of that chemical that
12 are being used for these discussions.

13 MS. BLUM: Eileen said you proposed a
14 standard to the background to DTSC.

15 MS. FANELLI: No. We haven't actually
16 even formally submitted a work plan. We have submitted a
17 preliminary document saying here's the method following
18 EPA and DTSC guidance for determining background numbers,
19 and we've asked them for their comments on that
20 methodology as -- if the Trust employed it as applied not
21 Presidio.

22 MS. BLUM: When do you anticipate they
23 should be getting back to you?

24 MS. FANELLI: We're hoping that they were
25 going to set up a meeting in the near future to include

1 the Park Service, and it has not been set up yet, but
2 when I say near future, I'm talking within a month.
3 We've been asking them to get back to us.

4 MS. BLUM: When did you send them the
5 first draft?

6 MS. FANELLI: A couple weeks ago.

7 MS. BLUM: Just recently?

8 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. Just recently.

9 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Okay. Thank you.

11 Hopefully I -- hopefully I answered your question.

12 MS. SEGAL: Yeah. Thank you very much.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Nice having maps and photos
14 together.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Moving on to -- thank
16 you.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: Do you want this turned
18 off?

19 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I'll do it.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Moving on to item 5,
21 Agnes, do you have anything for us?

22 MS. FARRES: No.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Is there any new
24 business? Jan.

25 MS. BLUM: It might be old business. I'm

1 not really sure. I have a suggestion for the next
2 meeting.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: That can be any of
4 these items here.

5 MS. BLUM: Mark Youngkin sent out the
6 panorama of landfill -- landfills 1 and 2, I'll just say,
7 and I would like to see if we couldn't get this on
8 overhead and go over the plans while we're looking at the
9 picture for the restoration of the site, where the roads
10 are coming out, what's going to happen, what the slopes
11 might look like.

12 We understand that's why you don't have a
13 picture in front of you, so I might suggest that for a
14 future meeting -- and maybe we can invite Terri Thomas to
15 come and pitch in on waving her hands over the
16 revegetation.

17 MS. FANELLI: Sure. The revegetation
18 plans are I'd say at the eighty percent phase and they're
19 being directed primarily by Planning from the standpoint
20 of where the forest is going to go and how the natural
21 resources people want to group their native plants in the
22 serpentine zones and the other zones.

23 We're actually going to our N Squared with
24 that plan next week, and then finalizing the construction
25 set for bidding and then construction in October.

1 MS. BLUM: So is it too soon to invite
2 Terri in?

3 MS. FANELLI: No. You could invite Terri
4 whenever, but there's -- besides just the native plant
5 zones. That might be your primary interest.

6 MS. BLUM: It's pretty broad.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: You're interested in the
8 final design plans, right?

9 MS. FANELLI: The final construction or
10 planting plans. They're not really construction.

11 MS. BLUM: I understand the roads are
12 coming out and you're going to have trails. I just
13 wanted to be sure I really understand.

14 MS. FANELLI: Sure. We could do a
15 presentations on that, and those drawings, those plans
16 are all posted on the SharePoint site and they have been
17 submitted to both DTSC and the Water Board. So they're
18 certainly accessible.

19 MS. BLUM: It's very visual. It's easier
20 for someone explaining a picture than to read about it.

21 MS. FANELLI: If you want for your
22 planning meeting, that might be an opportunity to take a
23 site walk and maybe Terri would join us in the field and
24 be able to point out the status of where certain plants
25 are going.

1 I might suggest that would be better.

2 MS. BLUM: Maybe we could have this an on
3 overhead. That's the difficulty in imagining the site.
4 It's a little bit of a humpback whale. It's in a
5 different locale.

6 This is really a good picture. It really
7 explains what the project looks like. I don't know if
8 you saw this or not.

9 MS. FANELLI: I don't believe so.

10 MS. BLUM: Can you send it to Eileen?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Sure.

12 MS. FANELLI: So you'd rather have a
13 discussion at the meeting as opposed to in the field?

14 MS. BLUM: I'd like to be able to
15 understand the big picture rather than parts onsite.

16 MR. YOUNGKIN: So review of the final
17 construction plans.

18 MS. FANELLI: Sure. I think by the next
19 RAB in July, we should actually have them -- if not out
20 for bid, very, very close. So that would be a good time
21 to show the plans.

22 MS. SEGAL: But in terms of the field
23 visit, because Doug mentioned graded area 1.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

25 MS. SEGAL: If some of us have the fourth

1 Tuesday of the month blacked out on our calendars anyhow,
2 that might be a time.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: It's a great idea. It
4 turned out just as a side note that Lew mentioned Tuesday
5 wasn't good.

6 MS. SEGAL: Not a good time. No problem.
7 But is the seeding project going on now or what would
8 be --

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Apparently the reason
10 why Lew mentioned that is some things are blooming like
11 right now that would be nice to see.

12 MS. SEGAL: You were going to remind us
13 anyhow when you go through the action items.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. That was a new/
15 old variety of business item.

16 Any other items?

17 Okay. Any public comment?

18 So action items, agenda items, we have this
19 landfill 2, fillsite 1 construction plan photo review
20 item.

21 MS. FANELLI: You want this at the regular
22 meeting, correct? The next July meeting.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. We have --

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: Can you have that topic?

25 MS. FANELLI: Whatever you're interested

1 in. We'll be constructing on E, finishing fillsite 1,
2 landfill 2, and I can get that information to you for the
3 next meeting in July.

4 MS. BLUM: I'm a visual person. I'd
5 rather see pictures with explanation than be out in the
6 field seeing limited things.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: A couple questions on
8 the agenda.

9 Brian has promised to bring a map
10 displaying the coastal trail and contamination sites. He
11 also will review at the next meeting the bullet point on
12 slides indicating areas of concern for one, human health
13 exposure scenarios; two, cancer risk slop factors; and
14 three, PAH deposition as an urban pattern.

15 He will additionally review fillsite 1,
16 landfill 2 panoramic photo analysis with a comparison to
17 construction/planting plans, and on that topic, there has
18 been a request to have Terri Thomas from the Presidio
19 Trust here for the next meeting

20 Lastly, there's been a request for updates
21 on FS1, LF2 construction and progress on LFE.

22 I think that covers it.

23 Unless there's anything else, we've reached
24 that time of the evening. If there are no further
25 comments. Anything else For the good of the order?

1 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

2 (The meeting concluded at 8:58PM).

3 ---o0o---

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

4 Eileen Fanelli

Brian Ullensvang

5 Julie Cheever

Gloria Gee

6 Barbara Newton

Toni Kramer

7 Jim Ketcham

Jan Blum

8 Jan Monaghan

Edward Callanan

9

10

11

---o0o---

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4) Committee Business	
7	A. Planning Committee Report - Mark Youngkin	4
8	5) Reports and Discussions - Eileen Fanelli	
9	A. Update on FS 1, LF 2 and LFE Construction	5
10	B. Fillsite 1/Landfill 2 Construction Plans	14
11	C. Update on Area A Bullet Items- B. Ullensvang	17
12	6) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
13	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
14	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - Not present	
15	7) New Business - None	
16	8) Public Comment - None	
17	9) Action Items and Agenda Items	61
18	10)Adjournment:	65

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the regular
2 monthly meeting of the Presidio Advisory Board of the
3 Presidio of San Francisco. My name is Mark Youngkin and
4 I'm community co-chair and I'm filling in for our regular
5 facilitator, Doug Kern.

6 Does everybody of a copy of the agenda? Is
7 there any discussion of the agenda items?

8 MS. MONAGHAN: I was going to ask. Can we
9 talk a little bit about the -- how we patrol? There was
10 a report that came out today or yesterday about that.
11 There's a soil report or something.

12 MS. FANELLI: The highway -- I'm not sure.

13 MS. NEWTON: The shooting range, the soil
14 testing?

15 MS. MONAGHAN: Shooting range. Okay.

16 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Should we add that into the
18 topic or -- that will be D, CHP range.

19 Any other discussion on the agenda?

20 Okay. Agenda's approved.

21 Any announcements and old business? Seeing
22 none, let's move on to discussions and presentations.
23 First topic is update on fillsite 1, landfill 2 and
24 landfill 8 construction project, Presidio Trust.

25 MS. FANELLI: Okay. I have no pictures to

1 show you tonight, but as you're all aware from last
2 month, we have moved on fillsite 1 and landfill 2, and
3 that's going along nicely.

4 We've completed all the final grading
5 plans. You were copied on that submittal over a month
6 ago.

7 The only plans that are outstanding are the
8 planting plans. We're still putting the final polish on
9 where the different types of vegetation are going within
10 the Trust and the Trust Planning Department.

11 I'm anticipating that those will be issued
12 for bid the first week in August, and then we'll do that
13 construction following the first rains, which will be a
14 planting plan, basically.

15 I believe at this point, our contractor is
16 estimating six weeks of construction to finish the grade
17 in fillsite 1 and landfill 2, so they should be complete
18 by the end of August.

19 Is there any specific questions you have on
20 fillsite 1 or landfill 2?

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: There's lots of soil piles
22 out there at landfill 2. It's just moving around stuff?

23 MS. FANELLI: They were -- yes. They were
24 finishing the grading on the serpentine side, and that
25 was completed, and they were bringing in their fills to

1 fill the terraces.

2 The methods that they used is -- we built
3 the terraces and then they filled them from above and a
4 small piece of equipment pushing that material down. So
5 I believe those piles were there to cover the terraces.

6 MR. KETCHAM: So the planting will be
7 done?

8 MS. FANELLI: No.

9 MR. KETCHAM: What will be done by the end
10 of August?

11 MS. FANELLI: All the grading and the
12 erosion controls will be onsite. The planting will occur
13 most likely in the October time frame. It could be
14 earlier. We plan to bid it in August.

15 Because we had irrigation, we will be
16 looking to the contractor to give us guidance on how long
17 they think it will take.

18 I would like to see things like the trees
19 go in sooner because they're on drill irrigation. So we
20 can get those going and then do the other plantings that
21 rely more on the rainfall, and those would be the native
22 plantings likely in the October/November time frame.

23 MS. BLUM: Eileen, when I was out looking
24 at the site a couple of -- maybe it was last week or
25 something -- it looked like the terraces were filled in

1 and they weren't terraces anymore.

2 Am I mistaken?

3 MS. FANELLI: No. You're right.

4 MS. BLUM: Okay.

5 MS. FANELLI: That was the plan.

6 MS. BLUM: Oh.

7 MS. FANELLI: The terraces are all in
8 place and they're retaining the soil.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: But we've in essence kind of
11 buried them. It's similar to what we did at landfill E.
12 To get a more uniform slope.

13 MS. BLUM: Great. Thank you.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: They added some drainage
15 in.

16 MS. FANELLI: We added some drainage.
17 There had been drainage in the original design, believe
18 it or not, and we thought -- we actually removed it
19 before we built the terraces, and we removed it
20 specifically because we thought as the terraces degraded
21 over time, and we didn't want little piles of drain rock
22 behind it that was on the slope.

23 So we actually took it out of the design.
24 But we put it back because it was serving a good
25 function. Probably not the best decision on our part to

1 remove it in the first place, But we put it back in
2 there.

3 So those -- those terraces should still
4 degrade over time, but they should not become visible.

5 MR. KETCHAM: What's the plan for parking
6 at the east end of the fillsite?

7 MS. FANELLI: The temporary parking will
8 be replaced. I believe we're putting a patch of like
9 rock, fresh rock down and we won't be -- what's not
10 decided is the timing for opening that with the planting.

11 MR. KETCHAM: Whether it will become
12 before or after the planting?

13 MS. FANELLI: Right. And I want to make
14 sure -- there's a lot of plants that have to go in. The
15 trees are the larger element. That's why I'd like to get
16 the trees in earlier, and we may need to stage out of
17 that.

18 So it may be better in the long run just to
19 keep people out as they have been out until we get those
20 trees in and then open it up, and then we don't have to
21 close it anymore.

22 We don't -- there's a sensitivity in
23 planning and in public affairs about confusing people by
24 opening it and then all of a sudden closing it and
25 opening it again.

1 We're working on that. I understand how
2 desired that lot is. So we're trying to figure out how
3 to stage the planting so we can get it open as soon as
4 possible.

5 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

6 MS. FANELLI: We are going to put in a
7 mid-size group of trees. The vast majority will be our
8 little Christmas tree farm size, but we are putting in
9 some larger stock, selected larger stock, and that's in
10 response to a lot of the neighbors that have been in
11 shock and continue to be in shock because of the loss of
12 the trees, and just to give it a slightly different -- as
13 it matures, a slightly different look.

14 We know that the larger stock is a little
15 bit harder to survive, to survive, but that's a decision
16 that our executive management team made based on guidance
17 from our chairman of the board, chairwoman of the board.

18 MS. NEWTON: How large is a large tree?

19 MS. FANELLI: About my height, say five-
20 five, five feet tall.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: No one footers.

22 MS. FANELLI: No fifteen footers, but just
23 slightly larger.

24 MS. BLUM: That seems hard to manage. Are
25 you having to purchase them in the marketplace?

1 MS. FANELLI: These are trees, so almost
2 all the trees, they're not propagated from our nursery.
3 They're all coming from --

4 MS. BLUM: All the trees are coming from
5 outside?

6 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

7 MS. BLUM: Oh.

8 MS. FANELLI: Except the native trees that
9 are little itty bitties.

10 On landfill E, we have essentially begun.
11 All of our approvals are in place. We are working
12 closely with Gwen on the final contract elements. You
13 will see that they've mulled our trailer to the site.

14 They were going to put up our site fence
15 today. That's postponed till Monday, but they're going
16 to start removing some of the mulch on the landfill and
17 some of the removing soil piles around starting this
18 weekend, and as well, and I'm thinking that they'll be
19 much closer to full production next week.

20 They are predicting being completed by
21 September 30th. We do not have a lot of float, if any,
22 again in that schedule.

23 So they should be working pretty hard and
24 fast, but we will be closing the trails in that area and
25 we have had the project information coordinators, PICs

1 onsite. They'll begin to run that area.

2 Barnard Avenue for the most part will be
3 closed a large percentage of the time. It was closed
4 before, but it will be closed probably more of the time
5 now than it was at the past, permanently from Fernandez
6 to the landfill east side until the work is done, and
7 then probably more often between there and the Presidio
8 Boulevard.

9 MS. BLUM: Is there any plan for permanent
10 security fencing in the landfill -- fillsite 1 and
11 landfill 2 area? What kind of -- what kind of public
12 control can be used to keep people on the trail and out
13 of the habitat?

14 MS. FANELLI: I believe our planning
15 department is talking about that, what kind of fence. I
16 believe they would like to put in their post and cable.

17 However, I don't think there's much of a
18 deterrent for dogs and animals.

19 So I don't think the decision has been
20 made. I do know that they do desire a fence. I don't
21 know if it's remediation that would be putting in the
22 fence. It may be planning that puts in the fence.
23 They'll decide what it is they want.

24 It will probably be on the downhill side of
25 the trail.

1 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm. Did you have any
2 additional surprises at fillsite 1, landfill 2?

3 MS. FANELLI: No.

4 MS. BLUM: Just everything is kind of
5 going along at this point?

6 MS. FANELLI: Everything is going along.
7 We have certification from DTSC that all the waste has
8 been removed from both sites, so that's final, and I'm
9 just working on trying to get done as quickly as
10 possible, actually, and now getting landfill E ramped up,
11 and that will probably be some pretty heavy production
12 there.

13 Likely not very visible to the public in
14 general. The site's kind of private.

15 MS. BLUM: Is there going to be a vantage
16 point where the RAB members might go and kind of take a
17 look at it? I know we can't go into the site.

18 MS. FANELLI: Sure. I would suggest that
19 you go up Quarry Road and in between the two buildings
20 where that -- there's actually going to be a new driveway
21 ramp on to landfill E ultimately when we're done there.

22 That's where we're going to have folks come
23 in. You can probably see the work from there pretty
24 well.

25 MS. KRAMER: What is the time frame for

1 that work?

2 MS. FANELLI: That work is starting now
3 slowly. It's ongoing. They're projecting to be doing
4 punch list items the last week in September.

5 MS. KRAMER: When?

6 MS. FANELLI: Last week in September.
7 That does not include the planting. We're going to
8 winterize. The planting plans are not done because the
9 Planning Department hasn't decided really what kind of
10 plants they want.

11 They have put in I know an order to the
12 nursery this year for the following year, and so those
13 planting plants will likely be worked on throughout the
14 fall.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: What's the name of the
16 contractor again?

17 MS. FANELLI: Guinn Construction,
18 G-u-i-n-n.

19 I believe all of the plans are posted. You
20 can anticipate some minor changes in the plans to the
21 design at the toe of landfill E for the surface water
22 dissipators.

23 Right now, if you look at the plans and
24 read them, you'd see there's a large concrete dissipator,
25 and that was actually constructed to meet the

1 requirements of our natural resources department for what
2 they wanted in terms of water flow and velocity.

3 When we re-reviewed what that looked like
4 for them, they changed their minds. We're going to go
5 with something a lot more natural, which I think is a
6 better solution, which will be a rock pad that will look
7 quite natural, and they'll break the velocity of the
8 water and flow.

9 MS. NEWTON: Rock pad?

10 MS. FANELLI: A rock spill pad as opposed
11 to a concrete trough, which is what it was beforehand.

12 So there will be a few small design changes
13 at the toe. There will be a few small design changes on
14 the southern end where we're trying to coordinate the
15 drainage with future plans for trails, and those will all
16 be posted and you'll get notification when they're done.

17 Any other questions?

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Still on topic A.

19 MS. FANELLI: Well, kind of on to B with
20 the construction plans.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Oh.

22 MS. FANELLI: We are using -- we are
23 planning to take some of the soil stock spilled at Miller
24 for East Bay MUD for construction of the landfill cover,
25 but we're also trying to use as much Doyle soil as we

1 can. Particularly on the top, and then the other soil
2 which meets our engineering properties for the slope area
3 will be on the slope.

4 The exact proportions have not been cited.
5 A lot depends on what we can get from Doyle.

6 Doyle right now doesn't have any additional
7 soil, so we only have what we have in storage
8 essentially, but we're working to maximize the use of
9 those native soils, particularly on the top where the
10 forest and the creek is going to be.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: So you said the
12 construction plans are all posted. Is that fillsite 1
13 and landfill 2?

14 MS. FANELLI: Yes. The only plans that
15 are not out are the planting plans for either site.

16 Sorry. I don't have any photographs. It's
17 been kind of a busy last couple of weeks, but I'll try to
18 get some next month so you can see the progress.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Eileen, before I start on
20 mine, do you want to talk some. CHP?

21 MS. FANELLI: Do you have some specific
22 questions, Jan?

23 MS. MONAGHAN: No. I just wanted to know
24 what the basic findings were. The soil findings, right?

25 MS. FANELLI: What we did is regrabbed

1 soil samples. One, we were looking at the soil around
2 the base of some trees to determine if it contains lead
3 above the cleanup level, and it did.

4 So we'll likely be having to remove those
5 trees as part of excavation because it will be too
6 difficult.

7 And we took soil samples from the backstop
8 area to characterize for disposal.

9 So some of it's coming up -- we knew it had
10 high lead, so -- well, some of it's class I. Some of
11 this potentially may be RCRA based on the preliminary
12 results that we had.

13 Those are the major findings of the report.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: It was nasty and we knew it
15 was going to be nasty.

16 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. And you were talking
18 about the historic wall remediation last time.

19 Is that working now? Over there.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: 231.

21 MS. FANELLI: It's not turned on yet,
22 because -- thank you for -- for taking me a minute to
23 remind me what site we're talking about.

24 The system is basically installed.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

1 MS. FANELLI: We haven't flipped the
2 switch because they're required to get an air permit.
3 Because of Bay School, it requires a thirty-day public
4 notice to the families of the kids that go to the Bay
5 School, and so we're in that process now.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

7 MS. FANELLI: And we're hoping that it
8 ends soon, beginning of August and then we'll flip the
9 switch and have the system running.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Okay? Should I -- he's
11 looking at the facilitator.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you.

13 MS. FANELLI: You're welcome.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: So tonight I'm following
15 up on the presentation I gave last -- last month. I'm
16 going to do this the slow way.

17 So there were two questions that I heard
18 last time that you were interested in talking about. An
19 update on what was going on with the Pacific Coast Trail
20 and a discussion of what I think was called the three
21 bullets.

22 So I'm going to start with the coastal
23 trail and go through that. It's pretty abbreviated. I
24 know that there's probably several of you have been on
25 walks that have been done over the last while and some of

1 you know nothing about it. I'll try to balance that out,
2 and if I miss something that begs the question, please
3 ask it.

4 So this is the slide I showed last month
5 where really we're talking about the mediation sites in
6 the area of the Golden Gate Bridge and to the west above
7 Baker Beach.

8 There are three area -- three sites in that
9 area of the trail, Baker Beach 1A, Baker Beach disturbed
10 area 2 and the Merchant Road fillsite.

11 I mentioned that the Trust has sampling
12 proposed for Baker Beach disturbed area 2 in August and
13 that the segment of the Golden Gate overlook is being
14 built in that area.

15 So just going through -- sorry the slide's
16 not showing up quite as well.

17 The Pacific Coast Trail's been in planning
18 for almost a decade. It started back in the Presidio
19 Trail and back with the master plan EA back in 2003 and
20 it's gone through a series of progressions in the
21 planning process up to the point where we finished review
22 through the National -- through NEPA and the National
23 Historic Preservation Act this past year getting ready
24 for construction start.

25 This is an overview of a portion of that

1 trail. It's a long trail. It's not being done all at
2 once.

3 We're starting here. This is the Langdon
4 Court area. The cleanup that was done five years ago is
5 in this area and this year, and these are the three sites
6 that I mentioned earlier. Baker Beach disturbed area A.

7 The Merchant Road fillsite, Baker Beach
8 disturbed area 1 and the CHP range we just talked about a
9 few minutes ago, and that's over on the east side of the
10 toll plaza.

11 Again, I apologize for the color here, but
12 the yellow is where work is going to be done this coming
13 season.

14 The bridge toll plaza is here, Baker Beach
15 2 is about in here. What we have are the major
16 components of work that's going to be done.

17 Two overlooks are being built in that area.
18 There will be new bike lanes added to Lincoln Boulevard.

19 We have two new trail segments going in and
20 they're going to expand the Merchant Road parking lot to
21 give more access to the area just to give you some idea
22 of some of the drivers behind these trails.

23 In the central area, which is midway along
24 Lincoln. This is the type of condition that exists
25 today. It's clearly not the type of trail that we would

1 like in that area or that a high visitor use area needs
2 to accommodate that, and it's certainly not a safe area
3 for bicycles to go through there.

4 So the bike lanes, you know, we have
5 conditions like this in which if you're a bicyclist,
6 particularly if you're a tourist on a bicycle, it's a
7 very difficult way to move through this safely.

8 So the idea is to provide class 2 lanes on
9 Lincoln, and you can see there's a number of other
10 secondary objectives coming through here, as well.

11 Also in the area of battery Marcus Miller,
12 which is near the Merchant Road parking lot and the
13 Merchant Road fillsite, coming from the batteries here in
14 the west, there's this covered way through here which is
15 Bowman Road.

16 It's a trail that goes on the land side of
17 the magazine and is somewhat depressed, and that was
18 designed that way to be behind the shelter of the
19 magazine service area for warfare.

20 But as we put through an accessible trail
21 through here, it's very hard to get pedestrians and
22 bicycles through that area.

23 The idea is to put a bridge across that
24 road to bring people through there on bicycles in an
25 accessible manner.

1 As in the historic landscape, an element
2 like a bridge can be quite difficult to be sensitive to
3 the site and it took quite a while to work through the
4 exact nature of the design nature for the Park Service to
5 approve it.

6 We've reached that approval, and it is tied
7 in between Baker Beach disturbed area 1A and the Baker
8 Beach fillsite. So the construction of that bridge will
9 have to wait until those two sites are resolved.

10 MS. BLUM: What kind of bridge primarily?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: I haven't seen the
12 detailed design. It's going to try to be pretty slender.
13 It's a light-weight bridge. It's not designed to service
14 vehicles.

15 So going through the construction status,
16 if you've been up in this area, you've see that they've
17 already closed off the Langdon Court parking lot. That
18 was a couple weeks ago.

19 The Golden Gate overlook, which is south of
20 the Merchant Road parking lot, and as you can imagine,
21 it's an overlook that goes through the center of the
22 bridge. It's a spectacular view when done. That's going
23 to start later this month.

24 The bike lane project is scheduled to start
25 in August or September. There's some contracting details

1 to work out, so I can't tell you the exact date right
2 now.

3 There's still discussions on how the
4 traffic control in this area. This is a major
5 construction project, and one of the options the Trust is
6 looking at in this area is to close Lincoln and put a
7 detour in this area.

8 That will be worked out as we get closer to
9 construction, and the idea is to have the construction
10 done by April 1st, next spring.

11 So that's what I have tonight for you on
12 the coastal trail. Maybe before we go on to the next
13 subject, it may be a good time to take questions. We can
14 always come back to it at the end, if there's anything.

15 We'll now keep going.

16 MS. BLUM: Brian, when you say the
17 construction is going to be completed by April 2012, does
18 that have some flex in it so you can actually meet that
19 target since the 75th birthday will be the following
20 month?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I understand there's not
22 a lot of flex in that. As you know, it's not all of the
23 elements through this area.

24 So it won't be necessarily a fully complete
25 project in this area. The bridge, for example, will not

1 be built as part of this construction.

2 MS. BLUM: So there's new versions.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: There will not be an
4 ultimate finish date. The idea -- the elements that are
5 being constructed would be finished, and as you pointed
6 out, with the bridge celebration coming up I believe in
7 May of 2012, there's not a lot of flexibility.

8 The other subject that came up and a
9 question I heard from you was talking more about the
10 cleanup levels for PAHs and the concerns that I had
11 raised -- expressed for what the Park Service understood
12 some of the issues were right now. So this is the slide
13 from last month.

14 So what I'm going to do is go through each
15 of those budgets. I'm going to start at the bottom and
16 go up and I've -- repainted this bullet up at the top to
17 refresh you and I've just gone through a couple different
18 points. I don't know if Eileen wants to chime in or not.

19 I'm not trying to be in a fully exhaustive
20 discussion here. I'm just trying to give you some flavor
21 of the elements that are going on right now.

22 If we wanted to, it would be quite a much
23 more involved discussion, than I thought we had time more
24 tonight.

25 The -- we have suggested that the area of

1 the coastal trail is really an area of the park that has
2 little urban influences. It's facing the Pacific Ocean.
3 It has a predominant wind from the ocean.

4 Even though there is a parking lot and
5 freeway nearby, that's generally most of the time
6 downwind.

7 So contaminants such as PAHs are not
8 blowing in or coming to the site in an ambient or just
9 general ubiquitous nature.

10 PAHs are a compounds that are generated
11 from a number of ways. Forest fires, for example,
12 industrial activity.

13 What it appears we have here is 1A, that
14 they're from the roofing material and batteries in that
15 area.

16 That roofing material was applied not only
17 to the concrete structures, but the earthen structures
18 that are west of the concrete structures to help
19 stabilize those from a flash throwback if they were to
20 fire the guns.

21 PAHs are a common element in coal tar. You
22 can imagine if the roofing tar is made from coal tar, it
23 can have PAHs.

24 The Trust has proposed that there be
25 ambient levels there and the idea of how to generate

1 those ambient levels look for settings that were done for
2 other sites, and PG&E and other utilities in the State of
3 California along with the US Navy commissioned a study of
4 manufactured gas plant sites, and they looked at those
5 both in urban and rural areas. They grouped the data
6 into different sets.

7 From those studies, the study talks
8 about -- these are not exactly equivalent. You know,
9 EQs, which is a different way of expressing the
10 contaminants.

11 So I don't want to tell you it's apples and
12 apples, but roughly that study suggested 0.89 milligrams
13 per kilograms was what you would start looking at a gas
14 plant in an urban area from that gas plant.

15 Our current cleanup level for one
16 constituent is 0.27 at the Presidio.

17 When you look at this -- this study, I
18 found four points in there that I believe immediately
19 tell me that that study's not appropriate for use here.

20 The first one says you look at the
21 stakeholder perspectives, and we've said that we don't
22 believe that it's appropriate, and there are three ones
23 specifically culled out.

24 Are there site specific conditions that are
25 similar to the characteristics of the sites? The Park

1 Service believes that there are not in this case.

2 Is it reasonable to interpret the ambient
3 concentrations for a given site that should be similar to
4 the site in the Northern and Southern California PAH
5 study data set?

6 This is not a mapped site in an urban area.
7 I believe there are pretty significant similarities.

8 Does the site have the same suite of
9 compounds as the PAH studies?

10 I haven't gone through that, and I don't
11 know if the Trust has or not.

12 Our opinion is this is not a suitable study
13 to use in the background.

14 The Trust has come forth with an alternate
15 proposal how to do this in a method similar to what we
16 used in 2002 to generate backgrounds for some of the
17 metals.

18 We'll get into that discussion I'm sure as
19 we progress through time here with the Trust.

20 Our position is that it could be done.
21 It's a lot of work. We have a system right now that
22 seems to be working with the current cleanup levels, and
23 we're trying to get these projects done before the
24 completion deadline of 2014.

25 Before cleanup levels took over a year, and

1 we're not of a mind to involve all the stakeholders as
2 we've done before and spending all that time right now
3 with using the agreement that we've reached moving
4 forward.

5 The second bullet. The Trust has suggested
6 that some of the exposure assumptions for visitors may
7 not be appropriate for this site.

8 Our position is that that the use of this
9 area is not significantly different than what was
10 proposed and talked about in 2002 for the previous work.

11 We do expect that there'll be more visitors
12 than today, but that people will still be using
13 recreation in this area.

14 Now when we talk about use, our preference
15 for sites is to have a lot of unrestricted use. Often
16 that's called residential.

17 We're not proposing that people live there,
18 but we want to make sure that this site is not somehow
19 encumbered with a restriction on what can be done there
20 for generations to come.

21 So all of our sites, we advocate for an
22 unrestricted use.

23 Just to give you some idea, there's a lot
24 of detail here. So I'm not at all representing that this
25 is all of it. I'm just giving you some examples.

1 It would take us quite a while if we wanted
2 to get through all the detail.

3 Some of the proposed changes that I read in
4 the Trust document was that the area would be used for
5 hiking and running and that visitors to the site would be
6 for a relatively short period of time, thirty minutes or
7 less.

8 That's not consistent with how we see
9 visitors in this area, either when we did the work in
10 2002 or today. We really want to have visitors come and
11 spend time at the site.

12 Sure, there will be people that run and
13 walk through that site quickly, but we know that people
14 go there and have lunch. We know that there is a very --
15 it's a bus tour type spot and people go there and
16 contemplate things and spend time.

17 It's very possible that people could spend
18 hours at a site like this.

19 They've also suggested that volunteers
20 would spend up to one day a week at the site for no more
21 than ten years.

22 We have volunteers who spend more than that
23 amount of time at sites in the park. So we don't think
24 that has any validity.

25 Staff, and this will be volunteer

1 coordinators and Park Service area, will spend four hours
2 a day, five days a week up to three years.

3 This is a considerable amount of time.
4 Some of our employees are long-term employees. Up to 25
5 years. There's a number of things we didn't talk about
6 with the Trust.

7 Not that we're saying we couldn't improve
8 on what we did, but it's a lot of effort to do that, and
9 we're not convinced that it's worth the effort.

10 Finally, the third thing that they've
11 talked about is what's called the cancer potency. In --
12 that has to do with mathematics and working through the
13 risk, and the ones that were used may not be appropriate,
14 and they're basing it on -- this is called a slope
15 factor, the window risk assessment.

16 It has recently been proposed for revision
17 by an agency in the State of California based on a
18 different study than what was used for the 2002 document.

19 It's not uniform across the country and
20 around the world for the people doing that that it's
21 necessarily a better one. We're beginning to understand
22 whether that is a better study or not and why it is a
23 better study.

24 What I found is EPA is trying to revise
25 this and they're currently having studies that they're

1 working on and trying to figure out through peer review
2 how it would be a better way to do cleanup levels.

3 It may not be right right now to make a change
4 before the EPA makes some opinion as to what they think,
5 and John, you may have much more to say about that.

6 MR. BUDROE: Well, yeah. I can tell you
7 I'm assuming that when you talk about there's been
8 revision of the best way to soil factors for the public
9 health program, which is the drinking water.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes.

11 MR. BUDROE: We don't even have one --
12 that's a draft. There's a standard that's already been
13 established, for example, for air and that's what was
14 used previously at least for Proposition 65 and would
15 have been used for the PAH program.

16 The PAH program may be developing a new
17 one. I will take a look at that.

18 I've got a question. Would it be possible
19 for the RAB to get the February 2002 study?

20 MS. FANELLI: It was not released. It was
21 an internal working document. It has not been sent to
22 any regulatory agency. So I'm not --

23 MR. BUDROE: Does that document become
24 public at the point when it goes to Park Service?

25 MS. FANELLI: I'm indicating that if Brian

1 would like to send it to you, he has that -- he's welcome
2 to send it to you. I don't control his distribution.

3 I'm just telling you that it was part of
4 internal discussions between the Trust and the Park
5 Service.

6 So if Brian would like to share it with
7 you, he basically has shared some of the elements. You
8 can read it yourself and get the more complete picture.

9 I would prefer it if Brian distributed it
10 to you than me since he's the one who's disclosing the
11 content to you.

12 MR. BUDROE: Okay. The reason I'm asking
13 that question is because I don't exactly know all the
14 details to how FOIA works in the Federal Government
15 system.

16 I do know for the state that as soon as one
17 department sends something to another department, then
18 it's -- that's what you can call, PRA, Public Records
19 Act.

20 MS. FANELLI: I'm not saying it's
21 protected. It's not a protected document. Certainly
22 not.

23 I'm saying that if Brian is willing, since
24 he's the one who's describing it, I think he's the one
25 who should be sending it to you.

1 If he doesn't and he declines to send it to
2 you, if he would send me an e-mail requesting it, I'll be
3 happy to send it to you. All right?

4 MR. BUDROE: Damn straight.

5 MR. BOGGS: In the PG&E study, did they
6 come up with a rural number in addition to the --

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe they did. I'm
8 not well-versed in the study.

9 Our position has been this is not something
10 we should spend a lot of time on right now. There's
11 other things that are more valuable to spend our time on.

12 And so this I see is a significant amount
13 of time to go in and really work through making a change.
14 It took a significant amount of time years ago and I see
15 no reason that it would take less time today.

16 So I suspect that it did, but I'm not well-
17 versed in all the details of the study.

18 MS. FANELLI: We should clarify that it
19 was DTSC that brought that study to the attention of the
20 Trust and the Park Service as an applicable document.

21 The Trust has not advocated to DTSC its use
22 in any of our cleanups. So I just want to make sure that
23 that's clear.

24 It is the Army who is responsible for
25 Merchant Road fillsites, and it's our position that that

1 document is applicable at this point in time.

2 MR. BUDROE: Out of curiosity, off of your
3 head, the current PAH standard, is that current and whose
4 clue factor is it based on?

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know an example.
6 That's the one that's kind of tricky on PAHs. It is a
7 1997 study and the UOE study is based on the 1999 study.

8 MR. BUDROE: Just the fact that there's
9 now, for example, a separate slope cancer study for
10 Nanapylene.

11 There's a number of PAHs that are covered
12 on benopyrene and benzene are separate.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's what I was
14 alluding to. With the two different numbers, the
15 equivalency and not -- there's a way you've heard the
16 suite on contaminants. There's a way that you can
17 mathematically combine them.

18 So that of the -- you probably know more
19 than I do. There's a number of chemicals that act in a
20 similar manner and there's a way to mathematically
21 combine the risk so that you state it as if it was all
22 BAP.

23 Our current -- our current .027 is less
24 than BAP as opposed to the equivalency of BAP. So it's a
25 little bit different.

1 I just didn't want to get into the nitty
2 gritty. I don't want to because it pushes me to talk
3 about it and I just didn't think you'd be very interested
4 in it.

5 So just recapping, this is what we've had
6 presented last month. Hopefully I've illuminated a
7 little bit more what's going on behind this slide, and
8 I'm not representing all that it is, even a small
9 fraction of the discussion.

10 and just again to show you what we've got,
11 the trail project coming through here, and we really have
12 four sites to varying degree impacting on this trail
13 project.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I asked for the map
15 last time, so I really appreciate this drawing. Thank
16 you for putting that together. I think it's pretty clear
17 the trail goes through these areas.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: It's totally a part of
20 it.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: The bridge I talked about
22 is in this area right here.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

24 MS. BLUM: Brian, just by way of fixing
25 myself in the map, where was the -- where's the

1 serpentine slope that had all of the landslide?

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Right there.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you're talking
4 about Baker Beach 2, which is right here. You can see
5 the scar. So it's quite visible in the picture.

6 Particular Baker Beach 1A bumps up right
7 against it. That was partly by definition to have a
8 convenient spot so there's no island between.

9 MS. BLUM: Will the trail be diverted up
10 above the past trail, which is now just six inches wide
11 or something like that?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: In this area where you're
13 talking about, you can see the trail goes around that.

14 MS. BLUM: Okay. That's a long-term plan?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's the long-term
16 plan. We have no intention of putting people back on the
17 front slope there. The trail is about six inches wide.

18 MS. BLUM: There's a battery right at the
19 edge of the lip.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's a battery right
21 here and Battery Marcus Miller is over here. There is an
22 open area that's been restored with a mortar pit with a
23 berm.

24 If you come up here, there's a chain link.
25 That's part of this project that will be replaced with

1 something that's a little bit more aesthetic.

2 If you were to walk through that area, you
3 come around to the front side here. There's been a berm
4 rebuilt here in historic configuration. That would have
5 been mortars behind it, and this is the slide right in
6 here, and that slide is still moving.

7 MS. BLUM: Still moving.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's still moving, so
9 we're keeping an eye on it, but we do expect that there
10 will be probably earth movement in that area.

11 So in that case, we're expecting it will
12 take years for that to settle down, and so we're not
13 going to build a trail in that area where it would be
14 highly vulnerable and potentially dangerous. So that's
15 part of the motivation to get people back out on this
16 side.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I wanted to ask Eileen,
18 if I might. These three points that Brian has raised --
19 the cancer potency values, the exposure assumptions and
20 the background values, the way he's put that, are those
21 three points a fair description of things that are being
22 discussed now?

23 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure I understand
24 your question. They're obviously concerns of the Park
25 Service.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess I'm asking, are
2 those -- are these changes that are being proposed?

3 MS. FANELLI: The only documents that DTSC
4 has, which I believe you were all copied on, is a
5 document that is proposing a methodology as Brian
6 described to develop background concentrations for select
7 site metals and PAHs, because we don't have background
8 numbers for the Presidio as part of the cleanup level
9 document.

10 So we've proposed a methodology, and the
11 other document that we have proposed or requested a
12 modification of the potent -- using the new potency
13 factor, and I believe you've all been copied on that
14 letter, so you could read it, but the 2001 cleanup level,
15 2003 cleanup level document is based on an OEHHA slope
16 factor that I believe was published in 2000, and I might
17 be getting any dates on, and the OEHHA updated that
18 number and it's been updated on the OEHHA number, and not
19 changing any of the assumption.

20 So that letter is available for your
21 review, and it's with DTSC now.

22 Those are the only two documents the Trust
23 has submitted to DTSC.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: So what I think I heard
25 you say is that you're proposing a methodology for

1 looking at background levels.

2 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: And a proposal to
4 establish new cancer potency value for --

5 MS. FANELLI: To use the new -- new OEHHA
6 issue factor in the existing risk scenario that's in the
7 2003 cleanup level document.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: So there's no proposal
9 to change any of the previous exposure assumptions?

10 MS. FANELLI: No.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. And the Trust is
12 aware of this April 2012 date construction, construction
13 complete date by the Park Service?

14 MS. FANELLI: For the different trail
15 segments?

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

17 MS. FANELLI: Yes. The project meets
18 regularly with both the conservancy that's doing those
19 projects and the Park Service.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just wondering if
21 you were able to resolve these other issues, would this
22 project be able to be on track to be done by the date,
23 April of next year, if we could resolve some of these.

24 MS. FANELLI: I don't believe so. We went
25 through schedule today, right, Brian? It's -- the

1 schedule for Baker Beach 1A has always been as published,
2 and Baker Beach 2 in the quarterly reports.

3 That has the construction and cleanup of
4 Baker Beach 1A next summer, not by April, and Baker Beach
5 2 is targeted for 2013 cleanup.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. FANELLI: You're welcome.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Okay. Thanks.

9 MS. NEWTON: Thanks, Brian.

10 MS. BLUM: I'd like to ask one more
11 question about -- I apologize for sunglasses. I forgot
12 my regular glasses, much to my dismay.

13 Did you say that the Army is responsible
14 for the Merchant Road --

15 MS. FANELLI: I did.

16 MS. BLUM: But doesn't the Trust represent
17 the Army in -- didn't the Army assign the Trust the
18 responsibility to --

19 MS. FANELLI: Not for unknown sites.

20 MS. BLUM: Oh, unknown site.

21 MS. FANELLI: Merchant Road is considered
22 an unknown site.

23 MS. BLUM: I forgot. Thank you.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Along the lines of what
25 Jan was saying about the Army, can you characterize what

1 kind of a role they're playing in trying to get this
2 done?

3 Are they trying to argue it pretty
4 strongly? Are we looking at difficulties in resolving
5 this due to them being in a pretty entrenched position?
6 Do you have a -- can you characterize it?

7 MS. FANELLI: I believe the Army had been
8 participating up to a point, and then at this point, it's
9 the Army's position that there isn't a substance or a
10 condition that requires remediation at Merchant Road
11 fillsite.

12 That's basically how they see it based on
13 the guidelines and documents that they -- have been
14 generated.

15 Now obviously there's a disagreement --

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

17 MS. FANELLI: -- on that.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we historically
19 had disagreements with the Army, and sometimes they would
20 go on for a long time, you know, years.

21 If we're going to do something at this
22 site, even within the 2014 deadline, what are your
23 thoughts about how they might be able to deal with their
24 position? How are we going to get there?

25 MS. FANELLI: The 2014 deadline doesn't

1 apply from an RSL policy standpoint since it's not an RSL
2 study site.

3 We have no statute of limitations with our
4 claims against the Army. They can go on forever.

5 Obviously we put pressure on the Army to
6 resolve things as quickly as we can, and we have resolved
7 I think a large majority of our outstanding issues with
8 the Army at this point.

9 PHSH Fill, for example, resolved and the
10 Army ended up paying -- we had already gotten coverage
11 for that unknown site from Zurich, but the Army ended up
12 paying a large chunk of that, as well.

13 So, you know, it's in the queue. We have a
14 claim, an active claim on Merchant Road with the Army,
15 and we meet with the Army quarterly and it comes up
16 quarterly and the Park Service is at those meetings.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Brian, do you have any
18 thoughts about where the Army is? Are they just kind of
19 hanging out and not moving or what's their -- I mean,
20 sometimes in the past, we've been able to be at the table
21 and be part of this and actually --

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not aware that
23 there's really been any movement on Merchant Road
24 fillsite for several months.

25 MS. FANELLI: No. There hasn't been. I

1 would agree with that. Probably since last fall, really.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just -- I'm just
3 going to throw this out. It's really just off the top of
4 my head.

5 I'm wondering if there might be some
6 benefit to bringing in the public in some fashion. We've
7 done it in different ways in the past. Just so it
8 doesn't just completely stall.

9 I'm thinking of things we've done with
10 Mountain Lake where things were so bogged down just in
11 disagreements, and eventually that began to unwind.

12 Would there be any benefit in having some
13 kind of a larger summit meeting, for example, with
14 different stakeholders around the -- trying to help move
15 this project ahead? Any thoughts, both of you?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would say that it's
17 worth a try. I mean, as most of the RAB knows, the Army
18 is a difficult organization to move, but it's been
19 effective over the years in some instances to have the
20 public participate.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, it would be
22 interesting. It's a really visible area and people
23 wanting to use the spot, you know, use the trails, get
24 the project done.

25 It just might be worth bringing larger

1 attention around it if we can do it in a way that people
2 are not, you know, further entrenched, they're brought --
3 they want to come to the table because they want to
4 resolve something.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: It would be nice to
6 resolve.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. I'm just
8 thinking off the top.

9 MS. FANELLI: I can take it back. I'm not
10 sure the Army would agree to participate, but --

11 MS. BLUM: I think within the Presidio
12 Circle Association, there's a retired base commander who
13 may have someone to punch up on the phone.

14 I mean, there's another resource here that
15 might be able to act as an intermediary to the Army or
16 strapped with rewards and what not.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. I guess just
18 trying to get at. Is the Army's position a negotiating
19 position, or is that what they really believe? They
20 really believe there shouldn't be any cleanup at all or
21 is that just something that --

22 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is that at
23 this point, they don't believe that there has been a
24 release, a CERCLA release that's regulated. So they
25 don't see -- they don't see the risk.

1 Now obviously the DTSC has sent a letter
2 saying you need to do something, so we have that leverage
3 working with them --

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. FANELLI: -- to try to free it up to
6 get them to move.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Perhaps with the Park
8 Service and the Trust and DTSC and then throw in the
9 public for good measure and welcome the Army to the table
10 and explain the feelings of what people want to get done,
11 maybe that would be a gentle coaxing mechanism to help
12 them move the project.

13 I mean, it can just sit out there for
14 years. We've seen that happen, just like marinate and
15 stew for years, which doesn't seem like that will be in
16 the publicly interest, anyway.

17 Would -- would the Trust and the Park
18 Service, -- DTSC can't answer. Could we as an
19 organization, interested community people, would it be
20 helpful if we wrote up a proposal and submitted it to the
21 agencies?

22 Would that be -- I don't want to put you on
23 the spot. I'm just talking off the top of my head.
24 If you think of anything that might be better.

25 MS. BLUM: Perhaps a -- Representative

1 Pelosi would be very interested of seeing that the
2 affairs of Golden Gate 75th anniversary went swimmingly
3 would be a help as a member of the public be interested.

4 She's very interested in the Presidio, so
5 she might be able to help in that respect, as well.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: Jan, I think at this
7 point, there is really no way -- it's not going to be
8 resolved prior to the 75th anniversary.

9 So that's not something that we're not
10 accepting as possible right now given that that still
11 remains, but we are looking for finishing the trail
12 project at some point, and that's what's in the works
13 right now.

14 MS. BLUM: 2013. There's an awful lot of
15 public activity that will be occurring in the area that
16 would be nice to be able to accommodate these 500,000
17 visitors who will be out there, anyway, doing strange
18 things on the property.

19 So I personally feel a little immediacy
20 about getting something going for safety if nothing more.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Perhaps another idea
22 would be something that we could start to get our own
23 thoughts together would be to create a resolution that
24 would have all the various ideas in it that we've been
25 talking about and kind of have that be the start of the

1 proposal.

2 Would that be something that people -- we
3 haven't done a resolution in a while.

4 MS. NEWTON: We could have our -- the
5 meeting we don't have anymore, the off day, the other
6 two-week meeting we don't have, we could maybe reserve
7 one of those for just a general discussion so we could
8 really all learn about what's involved and then what
9 would be involved in that project, what's holding it up,
10 what the ramifications are so we understand how serious
11 it is and maybe work on a plan or resolution or some kind
12 of community outreach thing.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

14 MS. NEWTON: Get the neighborhood involved
15 and we could do that.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: It just feels like
17 something along those lines, resolution, meeting, just
18 beginning to organize around this might be useful.

19 Because we've all seen how long it takes to
20 get just the decision document put together. For
21 something where there's even general agreement, it takes
22 a long time. If there's a dispute, it will take even
23 potentially longer.

24 So --

25 MS. NEWTON: It sounds like, though,

1 everything has been done. The wheels have turned and the
2 issue is out there. It's just that nobody's -- the
3 Army's being stubborn about it.

4 Is that true? DTSC has sent them their
5 feelings.

6 MS. FANELLI: DTSC has asked the parties
7 to resolve. DTSC sent us guidance for cleanup levels.
8 The Northern California study that Brian referenced that
9 the Park Service disagrees with and has asked the parties
10 to resolve the issue and come back, and that's where
11 we're at.

12 The Trust, the Park Service and the Army
13 are trying to resolve the issues.

14 MS. NEWTON: But nothing really happened
15 for almost a year.

16 MS. FANELLI: On that particular site, we
17 meet quarterly with the Army, and so a lot has happened
18 because we meet regularly with the Army and we're meeting
19 again, I believe -- either in September or October is the
20 next quarterly meeting with them. It's on our agenda
21 every time.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: If you're going to meet
23 in September/October -- and again, I'm just talking out
24 loud -- maybe we can present some sort of consensus of
25 the RAB, whether it's a letter or resolution or

1 something, that would encourage the parties to actually
2 resolve something at that meeting.

3 Anyway, a lot of ideas put out there.

4 Julie.

5 MS. CHEEVER: I just want to ask Eileen.
6 What agency of the Army do you work with? Is it the Army
7 Corps or is it somebody else from the Army?

8 MS. FANELLI: Bruce Handel is the our
9 contact with the Army Corps.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Is that who you meet with or
11 the other representatives, too?

12 MS. FANELLI: Primarily with -- Bruce is
13 our main contact.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah.

15 MS. FANELLI: We meet with others from the
16 Army, but they accompany Bruce depending on what the
17 needs are.

18 MS. CHEEVER: I have a vague memory from
19 years gone past that there were several different parts
20 of the Army and the Army Corps, which is that -- I was
21 only here for part of it, but it sounds like he's been
22 assigned to be the point person for the Trust.

23 MS. FANELLI: He is.

24 MS. CHEEVER: He's representing all the
25 different parts of the Army.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: At the meetings, there's
2 been all sorts of Army staff there, not just Army Corps
3 of Engineers.

4 MS. CHEEVER: What parts of the Army?

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I thought it was the BRAC
6 office, but I'm not sure.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Our experience with the
8 Army was always an interesting relationship, to say the
9 least.

10 Do you have a feel for how these -- would a
11 letter like that be -- or a resolution, what would be the
12 impact? Zero at a meeting like that? Would they just
13 laugh it off, throw it away?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't think it would be
15 zero, but I don't think it would be necessarily much
16 greater than that.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Zero.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Small, small impact.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: A small number.

20 MS. NEWTON: Two.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: But it would be greater
23 than zero.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Something greater than
25 zero. We like to have a positive impact. At least it

1 wouldn't be a negative.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't think so.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Something powerful.

4 Well, if it's on the order of .001, maybe we should have
5 better idea than that. Continue to think about
6 possibilities.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is there an arbitration
8 process that is invoked at some point?

9 MS. FANELLI: I believe both the
10 agreements between the Trust, the Park Service and the
11 Army, it does include a dispute resolution process, yes,
12 and we have invoked it many times.

13 For example, that's how we got resolution
14 on the Public Health Services Hospital fillsite and
15 several of the tank sites.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's not arbitration.
17 They're not going to a third party. It's escalating in
18 the agencies.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: What are the trigger
20 points for that? Sorry.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: It seems like a likely
22 outcome in this case.

23 MS. FANELLI: I don't want to speculate.
24 We just finished one dispute resolution with them on PHS
25 fill. I think we're all hoping that can be resolved

1 without going to dispute. It's costly to go to dispute
2 for everybody involved.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I would like to
4 say the current ideas have a positive impact quotient of
5 .001. We have had occasionally better influence than
6 that, so we'll look for a better number and something
7 that we can do. So we'll scheme on that.

8 MS. BLUM: DTSC seems to be a neutral
9 party in this, but isn't that their purview to determine
10 what the cleanup level needs to be? Isn't that what they
11 do?

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, it seems if there
13 are multiple cleanup levels being proposed like the Army
14 is proposing one and the other parties are proposing
15 others, then yeah, eventually I would think they would --
16 they could say what it would be.

17 MS. BLUM: Perhaps we could escalate with
18 DTSC.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Perhaps a letter to
20 DTSC.

21 MS. BLUM: Because they're right in the
22 middle and the parties aren't budging.

23 MR. BUDROE: That would be useful as an
24 action item, to get a February of that February draft
25 tech memo from whoever would care to provide it.

1 MS. FANELLI: The tech memo has nothing to
2 do with Merchant Road fillsite, however, if that's what
3 you were asking about.

4 MR. BUDROE: Well, maybe. Things change.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: So I'm just making a
6 note of some of the ideas. Letter to DTSC, resolution
7 and we'll -- we can either discuss it on e-mail or put it
8 for another -- our next meeting.

9 It does appear to me that these -- that we
10 have some time since there's no rush on the part of some
11 of the agencies to get this done. So we can hopefully
12 inject something to move the project.

13 Thank you, Brian, for that presentation.
14 Appreciate that. Appreciate the maps and you responding
15 to the questions.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm sorry the projector
17 was not quite up to the job tonight. It's our new one.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: That's the new one.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: The new eco-friendly one.
20 Next time, I'll make sure it doesn't break.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Well, I
22 think we have a fair amount of information to develop
23 some kind of response to those, but if we have more
24 questions, maybe we'll send them to you.

25 MR. KETCHAM: What is it that gets the

1 Army to move? Who has the ability to make the Army do
2 things that they otherwise would be stuck or just not
3 interested in moving?

4 If Nancy Pelosi's office or Dianne
5 Feinstein's office inquired into the issue with an eye
6 towards why is this not moving forward, is that the sort
7 of questioning that gets the Army to feel compelled to
8 maybe do something?

9 MS. FANELLI: I don't -- I don't really
10 know. I do know that dispute resolution is something
11 they do not like to do, so that's how we have resolved
12 things in the past.

13 MR. KETCHAM: That's the past, but it's a
14 hard game to play because we don't really like to go
15 there, either.

16 MS. FANELLI: Right.

17 MR. KETCHAM: So it's kind of call-your-
18 bluff-type thing.

19 MS. FANELLI: It is. I imagine that the
20 Army could move at any point. They can propose a cleanup
21 number to DTSC that is not in conformance with the Park
22 Service or the Trust wishes.

23 MR. KETCHAM: But the problem is the Army
24 doesn't respect DTSC as an agency with any authority over
25 time.

1 MS. FANELLI: No, no. They certainly do
2 respect the DTSC. Because the DTSC does have authority.

3 If you -- where this stands at this point
4 is that DTSC provided guidance on the cleanup number that
5 the Army is willing to adopt.

6 The dispute is not with DTSC at this point.

7 MR. KETCHAM: Who's it with?

8 MS. FANELLI: It is between the Park
9 Service, the Trust and the Army. Then DTSC's guidance
10 was to please parties, work this out.

11 So DTSC provided guidance that was
12 different guidance than the cleanup level document at
13 this particular site, and the Army has no problem
14 adopting that guidance, and that is the Northern
15 California study that DTSC has provided in various other
16 sites and other various --

17 MR. KETCHAM: So DTSC is the one that's
18 not acting effectively enough to put the Army behind, you
19 know, square with what we have to make a decision and go?

20 MS. FANELLI: No. I don't know if I would
21 blame DTSC. DTSC is asking the parties to resolve the
22 issue and come forward with a proposal about what they
23 feel is appropriate for the site.

24 DTSC doesn't do the science. They don't do
25 the assessment.

1 MR. KETCHAM: It's just a straight
2 disagreement between the Park Service, the Trust,
3 Presidio and the Army?

4 MS. FANELLI: At this point, there's
5 disagreement with which numbers are applicable.

6 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

7 MS. KRAMER: But that DTSC put this out
8 and the Army was agreeable to it, doesn't that mean that
9 they must have really lowered their requirements and
10 standards if the Army was willing to go along with that?

11 MS. FANELLI: No. I wouldn't say -- I
12 wouldn't articulate it that way.

13 MS. KRAMER: Okay.

14 MR. KETCHAM: It sounds like DTSC hasn't
15 put forward a specific opinion other than --

16 MS. FANELLI: Here's some guidance that we
17 have applied at other sites.

18 MR. KETCHAM: Right.

19 MS. FANELLI: Work with it.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: I went through tonight
21 the guidance itself talks about what would be applicable,
22 and I don't think it's applicable to this site.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: What made DTSC suggest
24 guidance that was already part of our approved cleanup
25 levels from 2002? That it was the new thing that they

1 wanted to propose it?

2 MS. FANELLI: This is -- their risk
3 assessment group is the one that proposed this.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: I assume that the new
5 cleanup level is higher than the old one. So I can leave
6 more in place with the new cleanup level than with the
7 2002 guidance.

8 MS. FANELLI: The guidance document, which
9 is the Northern California study, was the numbers that --
10 one of the numbers that Brian had on the board, .9 is an
11 ambient background number.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm just trying to
13 understand.

14 MS. FANELLI: DTSC did not advocate that
15 as a solution. They put it as guidance and they put the
16 solution to the parties to resolve.

17 MR. BUDROE: So the PG&E study was
18 basically -- it would be interesting to get a copy of
19 that study, because I suspect what they did was they went
20 back and they looked at areas where you have
21 manufacturing gas plants where you're talking like
22 Hunters Point, South San Francisco, you know.

23 You're not talking and saying Marin coast,
24 which is more in line with what you would see on the
25 Presidio coast.

1 MS. FANELLI: I think that the study was
2 supposed to be ambient background. I don't want to, you
3 know, describe it, but I would suggest you can all read
4 it.

5 It is an available document. I think it's
6 even on DTSC's web page. So you can download it and read
7 it.

8 MR. BUDROE: I can definitely see where it
9 would be a point of contention between the Trust and the
10 Park Service at this point.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: I have one other
12 question. If it goes to dispute resolution, is the
13 reason people don't like it because it involves a lot of
14 staff time that could have been used for other things?

15 Is that the principal -- it's like
16 opportunity costs. We're not doing the things we want to
17 do because we're involved in --

18 MS. FANELLI: I think that's certainly one
19 aspect of dispute resolution, yeah.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just looking at --
21 if we were to be able to craft a resolution, we've got
22 attorneys for all the agencies and we've got staff for
23 all the agencies.

24 Would that be the principal amount of
25 resources or are there other things? Like is there

1 actual cash or money that extra things that --

2 MS. FANELLI: For dispute resolution?

3 It's usually staff time.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you have a ballpark
5 of what your last dispute resolution could have been in
6 terms of that kind of opportunity cost?

7 MS. FANELLI: I don't actually have a
8 number. We keep track of people's hours and calculate
9 time, but I don't actually have a number for the last
10 one.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: I mean, could it have
12 been --

13 MS. FANELLI: We do track it, because when
14 Zurich has paid us, we have a clause in our insurance
15 policy that whatever we recover from the Army goes back
16 to Zurich, but we actually deduct our costs to recover
17 that money before we do a proportional share with Zurich.

18 So I don't have it off the top of my head,
19 but I do know that we have those numbers because we
20 certainly don't hand over everything we recover to
21 Zurich.

22 We take out our costs before we do the
23 proportional split.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: I mean, could it be as
25 much as, say, a half a million dollars?

1 MS. FANELLI: No, not anywhere near that
2 ballpark.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

4 MS. FANELLI: I think usually you're
5 talking tens of thousands, you know, depending on how
6 long it goes on.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

8 MS. FANELLI: From our perspective.

9 MS. NEWTON: It could go on a long time.
10 That doesn't mean it's going to get done.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: I just was wondering if
12 that might be -- you know, from a public point of view,
13 we've got our staff from our public agencies spending X
14 amount of time doing this, which is costing us these many
15 tens of thousands and they're not doing other useful
16 projects.

17 I mean, that might be part of a resolution.

18 Okay. Anything else on these items?

19 I noticed today -- I got a note from Agnes
20 that she wasn't going to be here, not going to be here
21 for a while due to her pregnancy. We wish her the best.

22 Do you happen to know if she's going to
23 have anybody cover for her?

24 MS. FANELLI: Just her supervisor if
25 there's anything. Basically the work she has will be on

1 hold until she comes back part-time, and I believe that
2 will be in the November time frame part-time and then
3 full-time maybe in the new year.

4 That's what I -- she has told me herself.

5 MS. NEWTON: We've met the supervisor.

6 MS. FANELLI: Alec, yeah. He's been here
7 before, I believe.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. So we
9 don't -- we don't really have them here tonight. But if
10 they were here, what might they say?

11 Oh, Bob Boggs. You can speak for all of
12 our regulators, even though you're just a citizen
13 tonight.

14 MR. BOGGS: I'm just a citizen tonight, so
15 I've been cautioned not to speak for the agency.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Of course.

17 Is there any new business? Any public
18 comment? Bob?

19 MR. BOGGS: Nice meeting. Thanks for
20 having me.

21 MS. BLUM: Thanks for being here.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you for being
23 here.

24 MR. BUDROE: They hired Matt Rodriguez
25 from the environmental law site, the California DOJ. So

1 it will be interesting to see what goes on now that they
2 actually have someone who is not a place holder.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Brian, I'm wondering if
4 you would be able to satisfy Jan's curiosity on that.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: And then our other
7 action items have to do with drafting something with the
8 very nebulous cloud stage. Nothing has kind of come
9 together yet, but we have some ideas that we might want
10 to -- I think agitate is the wrong word here. Just
11 constructively coalesce the parties towards resolution.

12 Because it would be good for the public
13 to -- with all the things happening.

14 I don't want to prolong this, but it just
15 occurs to me with the -- the yacht races coming up that
16 those areas would have been prime viewing spots.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think -- and I'm not
18 participating heavily in the planning of the America's
19 Cup, but I do understand that they want that, and the
20 Baker Beach sites are generally facing outward from the
21 bay.

22 So I think they will be less prime viewing
23 than some other sites.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

25 MS. BLUM: But with the crowds that are

1 anticipated, and if it's a nice day, people will show up
2 and hang out.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Walk around.

4 MS. BLUM: Yeah. They'll be definitely in
5 the Presidio.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: We certainly expect
7 visitation in that part of the Presidio to increase over
8 the next couple of years.

9 MS. NEWTON: Things are already increasing
10 in the bridge area. Every year there's more and more
11 time.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: And with new facilities
13 with the Bridge Center coming up, we're expecting even
14 more.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems that we should
16 have an agenda item of the coastal trail remediation
17 sites. There are three sites, at least, and the CHP that
18 we can kind of keep this monitoring, and then some of
19 these agenda items, the landfill E construction, should
20 be checking in on that.

21 Any other items come to mind? Well, when
22 they do, we will give them to Mark.

23 MS. BLUM: Eileen, when do you -- do you
24 happen to know when Caltrans is going to dig up the
25 Quartermaster Reach?

1 MS. FANELLI: I do not know. I do know
2 that they're behind schedule and they went to their
3 public/private contractor and we're trying to get the
4 same information in terms of schedule so we can move on
5 with the 231 site.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Any other items for the
7 good of the order tonight?

8 MS. BLUM: I have one for the good of the
9 order, and that is that the design guidelines are out for
10 the area that's called the Big Crissy Development. That
11 would include building 603, which was the former Crissy
12 Field Center, everything from Halleck to building 640, if
13 you know where that is.

14 It's just that little -- almost a Quonset
15 hut on the other side. So that's on the Trust website,
16 and if you'd like to have you participating in any kind
17 of feedback, if you're so inclined, and the America's Cup
18 DEIR has been published to the tune of like 1,600 vague
19 pages and comments are due on that August 11th.

20 But you may want to think -- if you have
21 any interest in preserving the Presidio and its habitat,
22 Golden Gate National Rec, your comments would be also
23 welcome on those two documents.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: And my apologies. For
25 some reason, this just came up while you were talking

1 about this.

2 The 231 air permit --

3 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: -- I think you
5 mentioned had to do with the Bay School because it's
6 within a thousand --

7 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: -- feet or yards.

9 Has there been any issue about the Swords
10 to Plowshares Building being --

11 MS. FANELLI: They get noticed, as well.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: They're part of it.

13 MS. FANELLI: And all the businesses.
14 Everything within a thousand feet gets noticed, so that
15 public notice process is in progress.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Because there are
17 actually people actually living there, and that would be
18 right next to where this --

19 MS. FANELLI: Right.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: -- facility is.

21 MS. FANELLI: You can go to the Bay Area
22 Air Quality Management District's website, and it's
23 posted there. It concludes that there's no risk from the
24 activity, but the trigger is that there's a school there
25 and you have to notice people for thirty days because of

1 the school.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Any other
3 items tonight?

4 I want to thank everybody for coming out
5 tonight. My apologies for being late, and without
6 objection, meeting adjourned.

7 (The meeting concluded at 8:41 PM).

8 ---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

4 Eileen Fanelli

Brian Ullensvang

5 Gloria Gee

Edward Callanan

6 Jan Blum

Jan Monaghan

7 John Budroe

8

9

---o0o---

10

11

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on October 9, 2011, 7:04 PM at the
17 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
18 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
19 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
20 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations - Eileen Fanelli	
7	A. Landfill Construction Update -	4
8	B. Building 231 Remediation Update -	
9	Confirmation Sampling	22
10	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
11	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
12	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - Not present	
13	6) New Business -	35
14	7) Public Comment - None	
15	8) Action Items and Agenda Items -	39
16	9) Adjournment:	41
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone.

2 This is our regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio
3 Restoration Advisory Board, August 2011.

4 Thanks to our agency folks, Eileen, Brian
5 for being here tonight, and does everyone have an agenda?
6 Great.

7 Any changes, additions? Announcements?

8 Moving right along, without objection,
9 discussions. Let's move on to landfill construction
10 update, landfill E, fillsite 1 and landfill 2.

11 MS. FANELLI: I apologize for not having
12 any photos to show you, but it's been quite busy to be
13 honest.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: A good kind of busy?

15 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It's been busy and I
16 haven't had an opportunity yet for photographs. I'm
17 guessing a lot of you will take time to drive by during
18 the day Monday. We just can't get in to see it.

19 MS. BLUM: I tried today. You can't.

20 MS. FANELLI: You can't get into the site.
21 You could view it from -- I think Julius Kahn is probably
22 the best place to view it.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. I tried to do it
24 from the overlook and you can't see.

25 MS. FANELLI: No. You can't see that.

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Walking past the tennis
2 courts and then go down. There's one particular stump
3 that's really good.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Julius Kahn.

5 MS. FANELLI: Or you can see it from Paul
6 Goode if you come up to the end there.

7 So we are working away. We are estimating
8 being out of there. EBI is going to be out of there
9 about mid-September at this point.

10 We have basically gotten the site graded.
11 The work remaining includes finalization in fillsite 1 of
12 the parking lot structure -- parking lot area -- it's not
13 a structure -- putting down something on that upper
14 portion, and that's the primary work besides the planting
15 and the erosion controls in fillsite 1.

16 In landfill 2, they have a little bit more
17 earthwork to do. We are doing a little bit of re-survey.
18 We're -- the area of Coy Trail where it comes into the
19 site and there's a little wetland area of the ditch
20 that's mapped next to it, we had three different survey
21 datums come together in a figure and created a little bit
22 of a bust that we're now having to go back and work to
23 try to make sure that we can get a twelve foot trail
24 section in and not -- and keep our stable slope and not
25 affect the little wetland in the draw.

1 So --

2 FACILITATOR KERN: What was the difference
3 in the databases?

4 MS. FANELLI: We -- our designer K.J.
5 accepted GIS Data from our Planning Department that
6 turned out to be -- which was not tied or keyed into our
7 system at all and kind of blindly accepted it, and it was
8 a GPS unit, so it was a foot to three foot off --

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Ah.

10 MS. FANELLI: -- depending on where it is.

11 So we had a little bit of designed bust
12 there, but we're working through it and I think all of
13 our criteria, stable slopes, twelve foot wide trail and
14 the wetland protection will all be managed.

15 If anything gets sacrificed in the
16 short-term, it will be trail width, but we're not
17 anticipating that's going to be a major problem.

18 The other work that's ongoing in landfill 2
19 is the stream crossing, so we're going to probably pour
20 concrete next week for that, and then we'll begin placing
21 the work in the creek channel and kind of buttoning
22 things up.

23 Other work that's ongoing there is the
24 installation of the irrigation line. It is extending
25 from the fillsite 1 Paul Goode Field area all the way

1 across to landfill 2.

2 It's the line that the temporary irrigation
3 to the plants will be fed off of. So that line is under
4 construction now, as well.

5 EBI has been passing through landfill E.
6 They are thrown off of landfill E as of tomorrow, so they
7 have -- we may be looking at small pickups.

8 They're mainly the materials that come
9 onsite are smaller, so they may be using the residential
10 streets.

11 We're also looking at using sort of the
12 back entrance off of West Pacific without having to do
13 any real improvements to that roadway, because we're
14 working with lighter vehicles.

15 We do have our final planting plans. They
16 just got delivered today from H.T. Harvey and
17 Kennedy/Jenks.

18 They are going out to bid in the next week
19 or so, and we will award that contract in the new fiscal
20 year, so October 1 or 2 and get them started.

21 So things are moving along well at fillsite
22 1 and landfill 2.

23 MS. BLUM: I'm surprised that the planting
24 is going to be contracted and not done by the volunteers.

25 MS. FANELLI: It's quite a bit of

1 planting. We're talking about planting over 20,000
2 individual plants. There'll be fabric cutting that has
3 to happen.

4 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. FANELLI: A fair amount of work.

6 So I think there's going to be plenty of
7 volunteer opportunities.

8 MS. BLUM: Are they doing it on a
9 compressed time frame? Are they doing it in a compressed
10 time frame to plant that area?

11 MS. FANELLI: I'm hoping that it's all
12 planted by December 15th, so sometime between October
13 15th and December 15th, we'll get the whole site planted.

14 That includes planting about 600 forestry
15 trees in addition to alternative plants that are coming
16 from the nursery.

17 MS. BLUM: That's a job.

18 MS. FANELLI: It's a job. So we're going
19 to have professionals do it, and then I believe the
20 maintenance -- we'll maintain the site as we normally do
21 for a year for erosion control and stability, but we will
22 not do things like weeding and some of the more
23 traditional things that the volunteers do.

24 So I think that there'll be plenty of
25 opportunity.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: You were mentioning
2 the -- the stream channel concrete, pouring concrete.
3 I'm not sure what that is.

4 Is there a bridge or a crossing?

5 MS. FANELLI: It's a crossing. It's the
6 crossing through the new stream in landfill 2. It's a
7 pike -- a culvert with -- it's a glorified bridge or a
8 low-grade bridge.

9 It's hard for me to call it a culvert when
10 there's poured concrete supporting it, but it is a
11 culvert within the concrete bridge.

12 It's designed to be able to get our utility
13 vehicles in, as well. So it's engineered to support a
14 truck that might have to get in there for the trees.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: So is that at the part
16 of the road that goes down and bends around?

17 MS. FANELLI: It is the part that bends
18 around.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: In the corner where it
20 bends? Yeah.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: You said rock in the stream
22 channel.

23 Is that permanent rock?

24 MS. FANELLI: Permanent rock.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is the stream channel

1 actually being built?

2 MS. FANELLI: Yes. It was designed by PWA
3 as a sub to Kennedy/Jenks and it's designed to contain
4 the flows and slow down the water, the velocities.

5 The rock that's going to be placed in there
6 is rock that came from the Doyle Drive construction, and
7 you can see that rock sitting in the dust bowl now.

8 MS. BLUM: Saw it today.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: What kind of rock?

10 MS. FANELLI: It's a colma. It's a
11 sandstone, silkstone. It's not particularly durable,
12 hard, but it is a native rock material, and PWA, the
13 hydraulic folks have blessed it for use in the creek
14 channel.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you know if they're
16 going to put in willow stakes and root wads? Is it that
17 kind of construction or is it kind of a rock bottom? Is
18 that really all that people think --

19 MS. FANELLI: The design drawings are
20 posted on the Sharepoint site. So it's a series of small
21 drops and then flatter areas --

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

23 MS. FANELLI: -- that do have the rock
24 armory.

25 There are plans actually plant the willow

1 riparian corridor to plant a rock willow corridor right
2 adjacent to the creek, as well.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Interesting.

4 MS. BLUM: Can you just point to the space
5 where you're going to have a culvert that a truck can
6 drive through?

7 MS. FANELLI: The truck doesn't drive
8 through the culvert. The truck drives over the trail
9 over the culvert. It's where the trail crosses right
10 mere.

11 There's a creek that runs here now and
12 there's a trail.

13 MS. BLUM: My mistake.

14 MS. FANELLI: If you take a look at the
15 site, you can get a good sense of the final contours. I
16 think it's actually rather nice. We will get it planted,
17 I think it will be quite lovely hopefully for the first
18 winter season.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Much better than landfill.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Right, yes.

21 MS. BLUM: Do you have any idea of when
22 hopefully -- when the neighbors are finished with all of
23 the activities going on there, including El Polin
24 Springs, radiating and dripping being and the whole nine
25 yards?

1 MS. FANELLI: You know, the construction
2 work in Tennessee Hollow expands into the future outside
3 of the remediation.

4 I think the El Polin Springs work should be
5 completed at the top loop, but the Paul Goode Field
6 improvements should be completed next year and the
7 improvements at Pop Hicks for the subsequent year.

8 So there's still a bit of construction that
9 our tenants are putting up with for the next several
10 years in the Tennessee Hollow area.

11 MS. BLUM: But it sounds like the major
12 activities will be done mid-September.

13 MS. FANELLI: The remediation --

14 MS. BLUM: Trucking and --

15 MS. FANELLI: Remediation will be done.

16 I have to say I think that the tenants,
17 depending on how close the activity's happening to their
18 unit, even small work can be considered major in their
19 eyes.

20 MS. BLUM: I know they miss the trees.
21 I've heard that.

22 MS. FANELLI: The trees have continued to
23 be an issue.

24 MS. BLUM: Yeah.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: 600 trees going back, quite

1 a few.

2 MS. FANELLI: It's several.

3 MS. BLUM: It's just gone up geometrically
4 without a buffer.

5 MS. FANELLI: The trees are tiny. Instead
6 of the hundred foot eucalyptus that we took out, we're
7 putting in two and a half foot Christmas tree farm trees.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: They grow like crazy.

9 MS. FANELLI: I believe that once they
10 start growing after a couple seasons, it will be a lovely
11 spot.

12 On landfill E, we are continuing with
13 construction. There's been a fair amount of earth
14 moving. We will cut basically the southern edge and the
15 western edge to pull waste in and get to final grades.

16 It looks like we can clean close in the
17 southern end and a very short portion of the western
18 channel, which is good news.

19 The portions that we can't, we have the
20 design, which includes a little liner three foot down to
21 keep water from infiltrating into the waste.

22 But that work is moving forward. They have
23 a substantial completion date right now of October 20,
24 and we're working to try to pull that back as much as we
25 can.

1 There is opportunity for Saturday work.
2 They won't be working this Saturday, but we have notified
3 our tenants for potential for Saturday work to stay on
4 schedule there.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you anticipate any
6 winterizing necessary for landfill E?

7 MS. FANELLI: I hope not. My goal would
8 be to complete the work such that all we were doing next
9 year was basically planting once the planting palate is
10 agreed upon and out -- laid out.

11 I hope we're not coming back to grade.

12 We always have to have a contingency plan
13 if we can't get it done, and that contingency exists, but
14 we are hoping right now to get all of the work done.

15 It seems once they kick in to be very much
16 interested in getting the work done, and I'm hoping
17 they'll hit their stride and be able to complete the
18 work.

19 Import -- soil import should begin tomorrow
20 for the cover. They are still in the process of doing
21 the grade to their -- they're a little constrained with
22 space, so there will be at some point a fairly large
23 stockpile of cover soil, not placed while they're still
24 working on their base grades on the site.

25 And then ultimately they'll be able to

1 place that material.

2 MS. BLUM: Is that stockpiled in the dust
3 bowl, too?

4 MS. FANELLI: No. This is the material
5 that we'd be importing --

6 MS. BLUM: Okay.

7 MS. FANELLI: -- from the East Bay owned
8 by East Bay MUD.

9 We're going to be using as much Doyle soils
10 as we can. We really don't have as much at this point.
11 We used a significant amount of sort of our extra on
12 fillsite 1, landfill 2 and sort of our final grades
13 there.

14 So I only have about at this point three,
15 4,000 yards, and we need 20,000 yards. So the vast
16 majority of the material that comes in will be coming in
17 from outside.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: What's been your review
19 of that soil in terms of the weeds and contamination,
20 potential and that sort of thing?

21 MS. FANELLI: I thought you guys were
22 copied an all of that, and it certainly was included I
23 think in one of the regulatory documents, but we sampled
24 it per DTSC's guidance over a year ago at this point. We
25 did horticultural analysis on it and our geotechnical

1 analysis on it.

2 In addition, H.T. Harvey did for the soil
3 what they did for the soil from Napa. They did a survey
4 on the soil that came in Napa, identified weeds that are
5 here or not here and made recommendations on how to
6 harvest the soil before it came -- it comes to the site.

7 So all of those recommendations are being
8 implemented, and once the soil is here, since we're not
9 planting for a year, our hope is to get it in place and
10 add some mulch again following recommendations from H.T.
11 Harvey.

12 So over the first year to -- if there are
13 weeds that grow, to try to kill those weeds before we get
14 to planting using mulch, and throughout the winter,
15 spraying if we need to if we have weeds pop up.

16 So use our approved herbicides, which I
17 think Wrap-up is one that we use.

18 So that is moving on. That's going to be a
19 tighter schedule unfortunately, but not -- not
20 surprising.

21 We can't seem to get started in May as hard
22 as we try.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: The road coming in from the
24 other side, the access road into the parking lot, are you
25 working on that, too?

1 MS. FANELLI: You mean the access road
2 from landfill E that goes to Quarry Trail?

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

4 MS. FANELLI: That will be left because
5 it's essentially the trail that will ultimately be
6 constructed.

7 They will use that alignment, and you will
8 be able to when we're done walk the trail to get back on
9 to the surface of the repaired landfill E and walk back
10 out.

11 At least in the interim until they decide
12 how they're going to finalize the top of landfill E, Pop
13 Hicks Field.

14 So I imagine it will close again at some
15 point in the future and they'll reconfigure our access
16 road into their final trail alignment.

17 It's pretty close. It's as close as we can
18 get it based on where they are and thinking of what that
19 trail's going to look like.

20 So all those design drawings are posted on
21 our Sharepoint site. We just today got final drawings on
22 landfill E on how the drainage structures will discharge
23 in the south where the water comes off the trail and then
24 gets into the channel that goes along the west and how
25 the water discharges at the toe, and basically it's a

1 simple discharge in all locations, a simple rock spill
2 pad.

3 The rock in this case is being sourced from
4 Vasco Road and it's being quarried. It's a brown rock
5 that looks a little more less highway like than a gray
6 granite that you might otherwise see as that kind of
7 spill pad, and it's designed so that plants and what not
8 can grow up in between it and it will not be a visible
9 pad in the long-term, but it will be there in the event
10 of that hundred-year storm where you need the slow
11 velocities down.

12 And they're actually quite small pads when
13 you look at the size that's needed for the area. So I
14 think we came on to a very basic, but solid solution to
15 slow that water down.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: I guess I'm just
17 thinking now about the -- the lower part, the target
18 range.

19 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Is there going to be a
21 remediation necessary for that site?

22 MS. FANELLI: I believe there is. That
23 site is the -- I call it the Barnard Avenue firing range,
24 but I think it's also technically called the Barnard
25 Avenue protected range.

1 That's scheduled for remediation next year.
2 We are contracting with Geosyntec and they are preparing
3 the Remedial Investigation Report.

4 So we have a few series of site
5 investigation data that hasn't been formalized into the
6 an RI report.

7 So their first task is to get that report
8 pulled together, and I anticipate that report being
9 issued September to DTSC for review, and then of course
10 you'd all be copied on it.

11 The primary contaminant of concern there is
12 zinc at this point, and it is not a human health risk
13 issue. It exceeds our eco values for the most part.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Given the locations,
15 are you anticipating that that would likely be like a
16 scoop and haul kind of thing?

17 MS. FANELLI: Yes. We've observed so
18 far -- and all this will be laid out in the RI report --
19 is the zinc that's elevated seems to be limited to the
20 upper one to two foot of soils.

21 It seems to be located primarily in the
22 creek bottom, although we see zinc throughout the entire
23 area, so we suspect it maybe just associated with the
24 fill, whatever fill or soils were brought in there in the
25 past.

1 We do anticipate removing from some areas
2 as of yet undefined one to two foot of that soil, and
3 potentially replacing it with other soils if we have to
4 to maintain a stable grade, but we have been working with
5 our planning group because they have some aspirations for
6 future wetland happening at that time in that area.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: That's where my mind
8 was going. I was just thinking about your plan for the
9 water coming off landfill E and then just going
10 downstream and eventually there's that area -- I think
11 it's called MacArthur Meadow where all the creeks kind of
12 drain right down into there.

13 So eventually all that would be connected
14 up, go through the dust bowl at some point. That will be
15 part of the creek system and then connect to fillsite 6.

16 That lab site is something when it's all --

17 MS. FANELLI: It will be lovely when it's
18 completely done.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, that's good to
20 hear that that's being thought about.

21 Welcome to those of you that have arrived.
22 We can -- we've been talking about fillsite 1 and
23 landfill 2.

24 Just to catch you up, there's been -- from
25 my notes, there'll be a little bit more earthwork at

1 landfill 2 and fillsite 1. The hope is that folks will
2 be out of there by September.

3 MS. FANELLI: (Nods head affirmatively).

4 FACILITATOR KERN: There may be need to
5 bring some materials in on residential streets because
6 landfill E is going to be moving into a remediation
7 phase, so they won't be able to travel across that.

8 So they may need to use some residential
9 streets, but it's anticipated there'll be small vehicles
10 doing that work.

11 From October through December, the hope is
12 to plant some 600 new trees in the fillsite 1, landfill 2
13 area and about 20,000 plants.

14 So that should be done before the rains,
15 and that would be great for -- for the plants come the
16 rainy season, and there will also be an irrigation system
17 that's being installed for that.

18 We've also been hearing that landfill E is
19 about to start. It's been anticipated that the fill soil
20 is going to be imported.

21 You mentioned there were some 4,000 yards
22 of local Doyle Drive soil, but we need 20,000 total
23 yards, so I guess the balance will be East Bay MUD soils.

24 That doesn't do it the entire justice, but
25 that's --

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: How about the bridge?

2 FACILITATOR KERN: The bridge. There's a
3 small culvert structure. If you've seen the landfill 2
4 site, there's a trail, kind of access utility road that's
5 probably wide enough for a vehicle to go across, and it
6 will go across the creek that goes down through former
7 landfill 2, and they're going to build a little culvert
8 structure so that the trucks can drive across it or
9 vehicles get across there.

10 Yes. Thank you.

11 MS. FANELLI: I will try to get some nice
12 pictures of sort of beginning to end for September so we
13 can review and see all the activity that was done out
14 there.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: That will be great.
16 Thank you.

17 Are there any other questions or thoughts
18 on these landfill construction updates?

19 Great. We have down here the building 231.
20 That's the site where we're going to burn off thousands
21 of -- we're going to burn off excess gases that are being
22 heated by the soil and extracted.

23 MS. FANELLI: That system should actually
24 be turned on this Friday. You'll see activity out there.
25 The contractor -- I believe it's TT -- it's not TRC. TSR

1 has -- has been out there getting it readied.

2 We did obtain our air permit. It had been
3 issued for public comment. No public comments were
4 received at all, which was nice, and -- which meant that
5 the Air Board people could issue the permit quickly
6 because there was nothing to respond to.

7 We got our permit last week. We gave the
8 seven-day notice that we are turning the system on, and
9 it will be turned on this Friday. That's the plan.

10 We anticipate it's going to run probably
11 through at least three months, maybe into four months.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: How will you, how will
13 they, how will people know when they think they've
14 achieved something?

15 MS. FANELLI: They actually will go in and
16 sample the soil. They have a plan to go back in, and I
17 believe it's outlined in the work plan where they will go
18 in and drill and collect samples to see if they've gotten
19 a reduction in the quantity of solvent in the soil out.

20 That will be their primary way of
21 determining if they're done.

22 So AMEC is still the designer and they will
23 be providing that technical oversight. Mike Beck you met
24 before, and the contractor for the next three months will
25 probably just be operating it, and then towards the end,

1 there will be a sampling and decision whether or not the
2 system has to run longer.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just thinking out
4 loud, but it would be super nice -- many of us have met
5 Mike in the past.

6 Perhaps when the thing is complete, you've
7 had a chance to review the data, it would be nice to get
8 a review of --

9 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: -- what happened, maybe
11 see a plot of the final data, maybe a spacial map --

12 MS. FANELLI: No problem.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: -- of the site, kind of
14 a before and after, hopefully a huge gigantic success
15 story, look at how great this thing worked.

16 MS. FANELLI: I guess I would target the
17 October/November -- the October/November RAB meeting and
18 if he's out there, he can come back again like he did
19 before to describe the system, to try the data and its
20 operation.

21 We do hope it's going to be a wild success
22 story.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Exactly, right.

24 MS. GEE: Can you provide a little write-
25 up at the end like to be put into a newsletter or

1 something?

2 MS. FANELLI: That would be a good option,
3 a good idea. I know that if it's really successful, I'm
4 sure our consultants will try to publish a paper about
5 its application here at the Presidio.

6 MS. GEE: I think for the Presidio
7 community, it might be kind of nice.

8 MS. FANELLI: That's a good idea.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: That's a really good
10 idea, Gloria.

11 We know for this process, there will be all
12 this closure and equipment. People are always curious,
13 and it would be nice to report out what it was about.

14 MS. GEE: Especially because the process
15 is so, you know, different -- distinctive.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: The visible sites are
17 really visible, so --

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Does everybody remember
20 what we're doing there with the electricity in the
21 ground?

22 MS. BLUM: Will that all be done for
23 Quartermaster Reach after this is completed?

24 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure when the hole
25 for Quartermaster Reach will be dug. That I can't speak

1 to, but I can see we're targeting next spring to begin
2 the removal of the residual contamination in the 231 site
3 area.

4 We are still trying to coordinate that with
5 the Doyle P3 contract.

6 MS. BLUM: Oh, yeah.

7 MS. FANELLI: That contract has been
8 delayed and delayed, so at some point we'll make a call
9 as to when we'll start or not start.

10 But they do have right of entry in that
11 area for laydown and operation.

12 MS. BLUM: Sure.

13 MS. FANELLI: So we are coordinating with
14 them.

15 MS. BLUM: I don't know how we can forget
16 that Doyle Drive is right in the middle of all that.

17 Why has that contract been delayed? Is it
18 money?

19 MS. FANELLI: I don't know why. I think
20 it's just the fact that it was -- I don't know who they
21 are exactly, but whoever made the decision to go out with
22 the public/private partnership, there are lawsuits around
23 that decision and implementation of that decision.

24 MS. BLUM: Okay.

25 MS. FANELLI: And I have not kept up on

1 it.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, that would be a
3 really very interesting report to hear --

4 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: -- how the whole thing
6 worked.

7 Okay. Our regulators are away on various
8 kinds of leaves.

9 Anything for me, Brian? You can take the
10 place of the regulators.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: I have nothing tonight,
12 no.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Nothing? All right.

14 MR. BUDROE: I have a question. Is the
15 DTSC rep out on leave right now or is this just the
16 policy of not attending meetings?

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I think it's the travel
18 policy, yeah.

19 MS. BLUM: We lost our last DTSC rep. I
20 can't remember her name.

21 MS. FANELLI: Rhadika?

22 MS. BLUM: No. She's the outreach
23 coordinator.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Medi.

25 MS. BLUM: There was one called Medi.

1 MS. FANELLI: Virginia.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Virginia retired.

3 MS. BLUM: Did we ever get assigned a new
4 person?

5 MS. FANELLI: No. DTSC is struggling
6 right now with sites that Virginia was overseeing, and to
7 my knowledge has not identified a person to give those
8 sites to.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Do we have someone sort
10 of reviewing the landfill E construction?

11 MS. FANELLI: The landfill E is being
12 reviewed by Perry Meyers --

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh.

14 MS. FANELLI: -- and that's ongoing.

15 At that point in time, Perry has basically
16 stepped in with Denise Tsuji being the normal PM with
17 Perry doing the heavy lifting, because we're in an
18 engineering construction stage.

19 Medi will be on fillsite 2. Medi will be
20 on Mountain Lake.

21 The rest of the sites have not been
22 assigned, so we're waiting to see who's picking up the
23 Baker Beach 1A, Baker Beach 2.

24 We're working on a data report RI for
25 Battery Howe Wagner in 6B that has not been assigned.

1 I do speak with Denise somewhat regularly.
2 I spoke with her this morning, and she has told me that
3 she is looking outside of her department and asking for
4 resources to be provided.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems somewhat
6 unusual given that the Trust pays for, you know, the
7 coverage that they wouldn't be able to find somebody.

8 MS. FANELLI: They're not allowed to hire.
9 They have a hiring freeze at this point, and there's just
10 enough sites happening that there staff is spread thin.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Um.

12 MS. BLUM: At some point, what's too thin
13 so the work doesn't get done or done well? I mean, it
14 sounds like we're at that point right now.

15 MS. FANELLI: I actually think that
16 this -- considering where we were many years ago, DTSC
17 has just accelerated just bringing on the additional
18 resources that they have.

19 It would be wonderful if they could bring
20 on more. It would go even faster.

21 I don't see it necessarily impacting our
22 ability to move forward, but if we submit -- we're
23 getting ready to submit an RI for Baker Beach 1A.

24 If DTSC can't review it, get comments back
25 or give us direction, that will be problematic because

1 that will be holding us up, for example, or the same with
2 Battery Howe Wagner. If we give them some report and we
3 can't get movement on it, that will be a problem.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: I was wondering if you
5 would be open to communicate with us about that. At some
6 point we can write a letter requesting support if it's
7 not happening. I mean, that would be one role.

8 MS. FANELLI: Sure. Certainly if it's not
9 happening. I know she's doing her best, because it's
10 kind of a delicate balance.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

12 MS. FANELLI: She's looking to get as much
13 resources as we can brought into the site. If we need to
14 have that kind of voice, I appreciate your offer and
15 we'll ask for it.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Great.

17 Thanks for that update, Brian.

18 Any other items about the regulatory
19 community anybody's thinking about?

20 One -- this is just like a real stretch,
21 but I've been hearing from some of my colleagues at other
22 sites that there are -- it's being discussed a little bit
23 in the environmental community storm water issues seem to
24 be some new things coming up or finally being
25 implemented, stuff like that.

1 I just -- that's just a big broad subject,
2 so I don't really have a specific question, but I'm
3 starting to think more about storm water and how we might
4 start a conversation around how that is Presidio-wide
5 implementation.

6 My guess is in the past that it's -- we're
7 exempt from having to do those things, but --

8 MS. FANELLI: I don't think the Presidio
9 as a whole was ever exempt. We're a non-traditional MS4.
10 I believe that category of regulated agencies
11 historically were not high enough on the list to be paid
12 any attention to by the state -- the state board or the
13 regional boards.

14 I think that's changing. That program is
15 managed by Mark Hurley in our utilities group.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh.

17 MS. FANELLI: From a construction
18 standpoint, as you all know, CERCLA is exempt from having
19 to get permits from the regional board or the state board
20 for compliance with the storm water, although we comply
21 substantially with the requirements.

22 But projects like the main parade ground
23 are not exempt, and so they have and are complying with
24 the new construction permit that was issued last summer
25 by the -- by the state board.

1 And it is a much -- I was going to use the
2 word onerous, but that may be coloring it too much.

3 It is a much more detailed prescriptive
4 permit. It basically dictates the types of swift
5 measures that you need to install and under what
6 conditions. So it's a -- it's a heavier burden for
7 projects.

8 With the thought, though, that that burden
9 is going to lead to better water quality during the --
10 during the stormy seasons, wet seasons.

11 There's also lots of requirements in those
12 permits on inspectors and -- being certified to do
13 certain things.

14 I can tell you that Ryan in our group has
15 gone through the training, just took the test this
16 morning to get certification as a certified inspector
17 or -- qualified practitioner I think it's called on storm
18 water.

19 And so our approach in remediation -- even
20 though we don't file and pay permit fees for our CERCLA
21 sites -- is to comply substantially and to implement all
22 of the substantive measures of those permits and to
23 manage the sites after the first year of construction as
24 if we were compliant with the requirements of that
25 permit.

1 We have lots of different ways of
2 complying, getting out of the permit. Once you're done
3 with construction, normally you file a Notice of
4 Termination.

5 It's predicated on your site's cover, which
6 can be through vegetated cover or composite or those
7 types of things.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: That's terrific news.
9 The one area where environmentalists as a large group
10 commented extensively was in the storm water around the
11 Doyle Drive issue, because we're going to build this new
12 roadway. Where's the runoff going to go and how are we
13 going to deal with it?

14 And I'm just wondering if that's -- not to
15 give you work or anything, but is that an area where your
16 department has any role in like monitoring what they are
17 doing?

18 Because it's on the Presidio and could be a
19 potential source of contamination if not done right, that
20 you guys would then have to somehow deal with.

21 MS. FANELLI: We don't actively monitor,
22 no. Our department does consult and support other
23 departments when there are specific questions. We
24 provide as much support as we can.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

1 MS. FANELLI: So we did, for example, the
2 main parade. We looked at all the materials they were
3 bringing in, we commented on their storm water prevention
4 plans to ensure that they were meeting not only the law,
5 but the higher standard that we try to hold for the
6 Presidio in general.

7 But we haven't had an active inspection
8 role on Doyle Drive. If called upon, though, we do come
9 out.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I'm just thinking
11 that, you know, with it being a national park, we have
12 two creek systems that are emptying into, you know -- off
13 Baker Beach that -- well, Lobos Creek has traditionally
14 had some non-CERCLA issues with, you know, reporting out.

15 It's always getting in the news. Really
16 kind of embarrassing actually for a national park to have
17 that.

18 I'm just wondering about the storm water
19 where -- what you would recommend for the public to --
20 how about we influence that so we really are setting a
21 high standard for the runoff from this national park?

22 It's not a question to be answered. I'm
23 just -- it seems like it would be a really great goal,
24 and if we could work with you in some capacity to figure
25 out ways of monitoring or just checking in to what we're

1 doing here.

2 MS. FANELLI: Let me do some research and
3 talk to Mark and see what our plans are, at least from an
4 area B standpoint of storm water planning and policy and
5 developing the regulatory documents that we have in
6 place, and I'll report back to you on what that's looking
7 like.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Great. That's really
9 nice.

10 Other thoughts tonight?

11 Any new business?

12 MS. BLUM: I have heard that the storm
13 water for Doyle Drive was going to be treated onsite, so
14 it will be interesting to know what the specifics were.

15 It was a large bone of contention, I
16 remember, how many conversations took place on that
17 issue. So that would be good to know.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: It still is a bone of
19 contention.

20 MS. BLUM: It still is?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. We're in
22 discussions with Caltrans about where the water should
23 go. We do not want it going into the marsh.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm sure that's where
25 they want it to go because it's like right there.

1 What are you thinking? Of it going into
2 the sewer system?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's storm sewers it
4 can go into and discharge directly into the bay.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: And we think that that's
7 a safer manner for both potential storm water and
8 pollutants into the marsh and catastrophic discharge such
9 as from a spill.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

11 MS. BLUM: So Brian, the Park Service I
12 understood was not in the business of treating storm
13 water on their property.

14 Is that still how the Park Service stands
15 on that issue?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're focusing on where
17 the water would go, and so --

18 MS. BLUM: Before treatment or after?

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Either.

20 MS. BLUM: Okay.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not aware that
22 there's any discussions of passive treatment or active
23 treatment in area A, but we are focused on discharges
24 both during construction and after construction into the
25 marsh and working to not have those discharges.

1 MS. BLUM: Who makes the final decisions
2 on that?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, right now, we're in
4 discussions with Caltrans.

5 MS. BLUM: Caltrans and the park?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the park. We believe
7 that we have authority on protecting our waters and
8 Caltrans is working, you know -- wants to go discharge
9 into the creek.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: And the thinking of
11 putting it into the bay, is just higher energy?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: And greater dissipation.
13 If there's a discharge either through the sediment that
14 would come off of normal storm water or a catastrophic
15 spill, if the marsh were closed as it occasionally or
16 sometimes it frequently is, that could be quite
17 catastrophic if you were to discharge something into the
18 marsh at that time.

19 Granted there would be significant impact
20 on the bay, but it would not be as harmful, at least in
21 our opinion, as it would be if it would significantly
22 kill the marsh or affect the marsh in some way.

23 MS. BLUM: Does that include the tunnel
24 washing machine?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: My understanding is that

1 Caltrans does a lot of tunnel washing, that they collect
2 that.

3 MS. BLUM: Like vacuum it up or something?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah, and they do that
5 for the MacArthur Tunnel, for example.

6 MS. BLUM: They do?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know the exact
8 method.

9 MS. BLUM: But you're assured that it's
10 not going to go into the storm water?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're talking about the
12 storm water runoff and spills.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems like what
14 you're talking about could really happen. I mean, it's
15 during the summer when it's lower flows, lower energy
16 that the marsh closes, and then it's the first major
17 rains when it might open, and that's also the time when
18 you're going to get the first flush off the roadways.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, that's right.
20 There's the storm water discharge, and we know the rain
21 any time of the year and there could be chemical spills
22 on the freeway in that area. That's a lower risk, but a
23 higher consequence.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, this will be sort
25 of a -- it's a broad subject area and it would be nice to

1 get a handle on -- that's a huge project to track, and I
2 know on the main parade ground, for example, we commented
3 that the use of reclaimed water, potentially you're
4 putting back into the system the emerging contaminants
5 with things that are processed out of reclamation plant,
6 the hormones, the vitamins, the things that might be
7 hanging around the water.

8 So that remains an issue that we're --
9 we're tracking, but we don't have a reclaimed water plant
10 yet.

11 MS. FANELLI: Not yet.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: I wonder if there
13 will be any hearing about whether that's go actually
14 going to occur?

15 MS. FANELLI: I think it's still a project
16 that the Trust wants to implement. I don't think that
17 they have a schedule

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. That storm water
19 is in the new business. Perhaps we can carry that
20 forward.

21 Any public comment?

22 Action items. We'll be looking out a few
23 months for perhaps a report back on the 231.

24 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: We'll be looking for

1 perhaps some photos on construction updates for the
2 landfills, how those things are coming along.

3 Any other items? Oh, I guess in September,
4 you were mentioning about RI for the firing range. Well,
5 that might come out later in the month.

6 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I'm not sure exactly
7 what date, but I know we're targeting getting it to DTSC
8 in September.

9 I'll have the quarterly report out
10 tomorrow, actually, so next meeting, I can give you the
11 update on the quarterly report, and I can include some
12 photos on the construction.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Great. We can try to
14 get questions back to you ahead of --

15 MS. FANELLI: Right.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: -- the meeting.

17 Any other items? Jan.

18 MS. BLUM: I'm just wondering if it would
19 help the Park Service if the RAB were to write a letter
20 or anything supporting your efforts for storm water
21 management.

22 Is there anything that we can help you
23 with?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not leading that
25 discussion for the park, but I can check on that.

1 MS. BLUM: Okay. Great. Thank you.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: There -- there is also
3 a broader community beyond the RAB that would be
4 interested in that topic.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm sure there is, yes.

6 MS. BLUM: I'll say.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Any other
8 items for the good of the order?

9 Thanks, everyone, for coming out on the
10 typically thin -- thinly attended August meeting.
11 Appreciate it very much that you came out tonight.

12 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

13 (The meeting concluded at 7:55 PM).

14 ---o0o---

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

7

8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
9 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
10 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
11 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
12 action.

12

13

14

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

15

16

17

18

19

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1

ATTENDEES

2

RAB Members:

3

Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

4

Eileen Fanelli

Brian Ullensvang

5

Julie Cheever

Gloria Gee

6

Jan Monaghan

7

8

---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

16

of the Meeting, and on September 13, 2010, 7:12 PM at the

17

Building 67, Building 50, Presidio of San Francisco,

18

California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527,

19

State of California, there commenced a RAB meeting under

20

the provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4) Discussions and Presentations - Eileen Fanelli	
7	A. Quarterly Status Report - Presidio Trust	5
8	5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
9	Denise Tsuji, California DTSC - Not present	
10	Agnes Farres, California RWQCB - Not present	
11	6) New Business:	43
12	7) Public Comment - None	
13	8) Review of Action and Agenda Items - None	
14	9) Adjournment:	57
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone.
2 Welcome to the massive crowd pounding down the doors.
3 This is our regularly scheduled meeting for September
4 2011. Welcome to the Presidio Trust and the Park
5 Service.

6 And are you representing the regulatory
7 agency tonight?

8 MR. BOGGS: No. I came on my own.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: He's an interested public
10 member.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, welcome to the
12 public and to our community RAB members. Thank you very
13 much for finding your way to the new meeting site today.

14 MS. GEE: Yeah.

15 MS. FANELLI: There are a lot of things
16 happening. We just heard that the club was completely
17 booked. I just know that there are a lot of events
18 happening this week.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Are there any changes
20 or modifications to the agenda? Any announcements?

21 Anybody have a great summer vacation they'd like
22 to talk about for about an hour or so?

23 MS. FANELLI: I've got a lot of
24 photographs for you tonight.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Awesome.

1 MS. FANELLI: Because I haven't given you
2 a lot of photographs. I have like forty pictures.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Great.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Excellent.

5 Mark, you could talk about what you did on
6 your summer vacation?

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: It's over.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we'll get on with
9 our meeting, then.

10 So our meeting is about the quarterly
11 report, and we'll turn it over to Eileen.

12 MS. FANELLI: Okay. So our standard
13 agenda, I'll give you the milestones, costs to date, some
14 details, photos on our program review and then go over
15 our next quarter activities.

16 Our third quarter milestones are listed in
17 the quarterly report, which you've probably now had for I
18 think a month.

19 Under CERCLA, I got with Final FS/RAP for
20 landfill E. This one that was referred to was approved
21 and remedial construction initiated.

22 We also started about a month before E on
23 the final grade on fillsite 1 and landfill 2, and we
24 completed the Remedial Action Workplan for 937 and we
25 retained a contractor.

1 The contractor was scheduled to begin in
2 August, but we have put him off till October for other
3 uses of the building and for fiscal year issues. But
4 they should start first week in October.

5 Under petroleum, we submitted the
6 Construction Completion Report and a Modified Groundwater
7 Monitoring Plan with the building 1349 site.

8 Agnes, before she went off on maternity
9 leave, concurred an all of those proposed modifications,
10 and I can talk about those a little bit later.

11 We also got Water Board approval of and we
12 initiated the in situ thermal treatments at the building
13 228 site. So that has been up and running for a while
14 now.

15 And on lead-based paint, we are in sort of
16 a production mode. We have been submitting requests for
17 no further action and receiving concurrence, and I
18 believe you're copied on --

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

20 MS. FANELLI: -- those.

21 From a budget standpoint, we're -- we
22 upticked our estimated cost at completion by a little. I
23 think it was at 162. Now it's 163, 163 million dollars.

24 We have accrued over a million dollars to
25 date and are looking at remaining to spend of about 46 --

1 that's right. 46,000.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: 46 million.

3 MS. FANELLI: 46 million. Excuse me.

4 Close to 47 million.

5 The projects that had the most activity are
6 listed here. Landfill 10 is a little bit of a misnomer.
7 We hadn't been doing work out there.

8 This was an accounting change where we took
9 costs from a pool that we had and we moved -- where we
10 keep them and we move them over to landfill 10, but we
11 did do our quarterly groundwater monitoring.

12 I think we might have paid a final invoice
13 to ERRG for the repair, which I have some photographs
14 here.

15 So there is a little bit of activity there,
16 and understandably, our biggest cost of fillsite 1,
17 landfill 2 and landfill E and 207 where we are beginning
18 our in situ treatment and we got a six-month bill from
19 DTSC, so those were the biggest cost activities.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Before you move --

21 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: -- on landfill 2, just
23 noticing the difference between the cumulative and about
24 budget.

25 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you anticipate --
2 you may not -- for me probably got a ways to go, but on
3 2, are we getting close?

4 MS. FANELLI: I think we're going to be
5 close to our budget, yeah. We had not completed as much
6 of the grading work at 2 when we closed up last year. So
7 we still had a fair amount to go in terms of final
8 grading before we did all the restoration.

9 Right now, we have the bids out for the
10 planting and we're waiting to get those in.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: So you think there's
12 still, what? Two and a half million or whatever to go?

13 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. This is through 6-30,
14 so I know I've approved several invoices last month for
15 probably close to a million.

16 So yes, I think that we may be close to
17 that 8.9.

18 This is just the big picture overview. It
19 shows you our offsets in terms of interest, to-date
20 claims received, seven-million-four and the remaining
21 costs which -- the majority of those we believe will be
22 covered under the RSL, and there's about four million in
23 unknown costs in there, which if the unknown
24 contamination claim is accepted will be covered.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Is there a category

1 that might even be one that you track, but are there
2 potential claims on unknown sites that you think you
3 might be successful on?

4 MS. FANELLI: At this point, almost all
5 the unknown sites, we assume that they are going to be
6 recovered.

7 I think we assume approximately -- like for
8 the miscellaneous sites, I think we carried maybe a
9 hundred thousand dollars in unrecoverable costs kind of
10 for the assessment activities, but the rest we assume
11 there would be coverage and they would be reimbursed
12 under the -- either the Army or other.

13 But we do to correct myself carry a little
14 bit of costs up-front, but not significant. Relative to
15 the cost of most remediation projects.

16 So now my pictures begin. So I have
17 several on fillsite 1 and landfill 2, and this first
18 picture was taken in May, and it was at the very
19 beginning of the work where we asked EBI to come back
20 onsite and mobilize.

21 We kind of see the sed pond. That was the
22 basic pond and fabric on the slopes.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: It looks like snow.

24 MS. FANELLI: No. It's not snow. I think
25 it's a piece of plastic.

1 Another picture. There was some fabric
2 there that you see and some of the materials that EBI
3 had.

4 You can see EBI out there beginning to
5 restart things and take things down. This is when
6 they're beginning to rebuild the slope. So they were
7 bringing in the serpentine for the serpentine slope and
8 put it in place.

9 This is when we were actually doing some of
10 the repairs on the upper terraces where we had some --
11 put in some mulch as erosion protection.

12 We took that out, scraped off some of the
13 upper materials to remix it, because it had compost in
14 it, and ultimately placed it back.

15 We also added drainage. We originally had
16 this in our design and we took it out. When we decided
17 that we were going to bury the terraces, we put it back
18 in.

19 So you can see behind each of the terraces,
20 there is a drain rock and pipe. Those pipes discharge
21 into the new creek.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Do they have holes in
23 there -- it's --

24 MS. FANELLI: It's a perforated pipe. You
25 can't tell from the photograph.

1 These are the lower terraces, so the lower
2 terraces were all constructed in June, and they have the
3 same pipe behind them.

4 And this is the dozer. These are actually
5 now pushing the material back in and covering them, so
6 you can see how they were buried from up above. That
7 material was pushed back down.

8 So it was a little tricky and very time-
9 consuming, that you couldn't put a lot of weight
10 obviously on to the structure. So they would stack up
11 the material and push it down.

12 That's all basically Doyle Drive, colma
13 sands.

14 MR. BOGGS: Were they compacting it all
15 when they placed it in there?

16 MS. FANELLI: No. It was loosely placed.
17 That was the idea. That was the desire from Forestry,
18 because this is -- was for loose non-compacted soil.
19 It's always for non-compacted soil.

20 That was the issue. How do you get non-
21 compacted sand to stay on the hill? You have to do
22 something, right?

23 So the decision to use the terraces was how
24 we were going to do that, because we could put loosely
25 compacted material and then we dealt with some of the

1 final issues with how the land form, the land shape
2 looked back to its original by basically burying them.

3 Let's see. Oh. So what you see here is
4 fillsite 1. So in this area, what you can -- what I
5 wanted to point out is the channel.

6 So you can see that the rock channel that
7 used to be a linear was modified and it looks actually
8 very much now like the channel along the side of landfill
9 10.

10 So basically what we did was to try to make
11 a wider swale and supply these cutoffs so if water
12 focused, which we anticipate it will, because there's the
13 storm water drains in up above, Julius Kahn.

14 If it starts to incise, it will hit the
15 rock cutoff and dissipate the energy, and spread back
16 down.

17 So we did that same type of treatment in
18 fillsite 1, and the soil is basically minor grading where
19 we cut a little bit from the toe and we place a little
20 bit up at the top to give it less of a bowl shape and
21 fill out the area near the parking -- the future parking
22 lot.

23 This is a picture of basically done. We've
24 got our final grades. They actually by this time put
25 some fabric back and seeds and what not, and you can see

1 where -- no. I'm going -- I'm not sure that's accurate.
2 I might call myself a liar because it
3 couldn't -- we don't see in the background -- landfill 2
4 I'm looking at doesn't look like we have all of the
5 terraces in.

6 It's hard for me to tell in this
7 photograph. No. We have them in. So this has to be in
8 August. So I think that's correct. This is about when
9 it's done.

10 Fillsite 1 is basically pretty much
11 buttoned up. There's not a lot left to do out there.

12 This is also in August, and one of the few
13 things that are left to do is to finish the irrigation.
14 So this is the main line.

15 It's going in along the trail that's taking
16 water in near Paul Goode Field all the way over to the
17 landfill 2 site. It will be used for temporary
18 irrigation to get plant establishment at both sites.

19 That's a good picture, too. You can see
20 the area of landfill 2. The soils placed on the bottom
21 and on the top, and you can see the incinerator the
22 little -- it looks almost blue that was put back -- put
23 back in place.

24 This is rebar for the stream crossing of
25 landfill 2. So that was constructed. It has since been

1 poured, at least the foundation poured and there's
2 another pour tomorrow, the final bore on that.

3 This is holding us up a little bit. The
4 contractor is scheduled with -- they're not able to
5 complete the irrigation pipe until they get this done.

6 The irrigation pipe is going to go over it.
7 Hopefully they'll get that finished as soon as they get
8 this poured.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: The creek goes
10 underneath this?

11 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm. This is actually a
12 design that came from our Planning Department. There is
13 a pipe underneath it and there's a concrete head wall.

14 They wanted a minimum footprint, so we
15 tried constructing it or gave them a design. We had a
16 first design, which was a wet crossing, and the decision
17 was that they didn't want a wet crossing.

18 So we ended up putting in sort of a
19 culvert, if you will, and then to minimize the -- the
20 physical structure, it has a concrete head wall so it
21 doesn't have a larger trail of rock and riprap to support
22 it.

23 This is the bottom of the stream. So this
24 is -- at the very bottom of the retention. A
25 sedimentation basin spills down below into the wetland,

1 and the design there calls for a series of log
2 structures.

3 So these are Presidio logs that are being
4 wrapped in burlap and placed in that creek channel to
5 slow the water down that comes out of the sedimentation
6 pond, and when they were constructing this, they were
7 getting close to the final, and we uncovered a cultural
8 feature.

9 So this is cobble set in cement, very
10 similar to what was in the old El Polin Loop, and we
11 uncovered it further upstream, and so the sense is that
12 it actually probably extended further up.

13 It was actually evidence that the historic
14 dam that had been thought was up further was indeed
15 there, and because -- this is just below where that was
16 thought to be, and it was buried by about a foot of soil.

17 So we hit this and we basically stopped,
18 because we had two more log structures to go down, and
19 the decision was made not to install those log
20 structures, because if we did, we would have had to have
21 destroyed this future.

22 We worked with our historical people and we
23 came up with a basic plan. What we did is put in some
24 additional rock.

25 This is rock actually again from the rock

1 pile at the dust bowl. So this is rock from the Doyle
2 Drive project, rocky soils that were excavated.

3 We put in some fabrics and cushioning sands
4 and then the logs go last. This will work fine until
5 such time that our cultural people decide what they want
6 to do about that spillway, that structure.

7 If they want to try to incorporate it into
8 a future stream or whatever. That was one little
9 surprise that happened.

10 Here is pictures of the compost going on
11 and seed installation. So we are seeding the site with a
12 mixture of native grasses propagated from the Presidio
13 and sterile wheat grass, and we did apply composts and I
14 think some other amendments, maybe some gypsum.

15 It was all spec'd up for the further design
16 by H.J. Harvey & Associates on the site.

17 You can sort of see the channel and you can
18 see these little white -- these little white things are
19 those drainage pipes that are showing up in the creek.

20 They'll ultimately be buried. You're not
21 going to see them.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: Where's the bridge on this?

23 MS. FANELLI: It should be in place, but
24 it's up in this crossing here.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Thank you.

1 MS. FANELLI: It probably says August, but
2 I may not have them in exact date order.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you know -- I guess
4 the right-hand side is that kind of lighter color.
5 That's serpentine?

6 MS. FANELLI: That's the serpentine slope.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Do they intend to plant
8 that, as well?

9 MS. FANELLI: Yes. It will be planted.
10 It will be planted with native plants from the nursery.
11 It's actually going to be fairly heavily planted.

12 I think on one and a half foot centers.
13 Very small plugs. I think it's virtually all grasses
14 that are being planted.

15 The soil is not particularly -- doesn't
16 have nutrients in it.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

18 MS. FANELLI: It's subsoil. The decision
19 has been made not to amend it. So it will be interesting
20 to see how growth occurs.

21 I think we're all fairly confident that
22 growth will occur. It just may take a little bit longer
23 for the plants to establish.

24 So there's where you can see the wood
25 structure. That is the frames, the forms for where the

1 bridge will go.

2 I hate to call it a bridge. It's really a
3 culvert, but it is -- it's fairly robust so that
4 emergency vehicle or truck can get across it. So it's
5 rated to hold a fair amount of weight.

6 You can see the seed and material going in
7 on the upper deck, upper terraced area there. You can
8 see the fabric has been placed on fillsite 1. You can
9 see the trench with the irrigation piping.

10 So that's another little behind schedule,
11 in part because of the concrete. Hopefully they're
12 testing that pipe in the next couple of days.

13 Even if it's not at its full extension,
14 they need to test it, put pressure on it before they
15 backfill.

16 So hopefully they'll get that accomplished
17 in the next couple days and we'll get that covered,
18 buried. And then they'll only have to test the extension
19 portion of it when they get that much done.

20 Here's our channel installation. So you
21 can see the rock being placed at the confluence there of
22 the serpentine slope and our colma, and that rock again
23 is all sourced from the Doyle project. So it is rock
24 from the Presidio.

25 And you can see the sedimentation retention

1 basin at the toe. That is natural groundwater, seepage
2 that's in there -- it hasn't rained -- and it's designed
3 to hold a certain amount and meter it out.

4 It's designed to absorb a certain amount of
5 sedimentation as the site stabilizes, and ultimately
6 become a wetland, either volunteer or supported by our
7 Natural Resources people that will try to coax it along.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: With the retention
9 basin, has anybody raised any issues about bugs,
10 mosquitoes?

11 MS. FANELLI: Not to me personally. I
12 know the issue has come up and we do have a program where
13 we do mosquito abatement.

14 It will be interesting to see how wet this
15 stays and if they need to apply mosquito -- last year was
16 a wet year, but even so, we're at the end of summer here
17 and there's still water seepage.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: It could be that it
19 flows enough. I don't know that the mosquito larvae will
20 be able to exist.

21 I just mention it because this has in
22 the -- every year that I've been around the Presidio,
23 when people see a water feature that remains like this,
24 somebody raises it, and it just might be good to have
25 some thought about, you know, oh, yes, we do have this

1 plan or whatever.

2 MS. FANELLI: Uh-huh. No, that's a good
3 point.

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: That rock in the middle is
5 part of the basin?

6 MS. FANELLI: Part of the design.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: To slow it down.

8 MS. FANELLI: That's naturally
9 constructed. Like a baffle if you looked at it from
10 above.

11 MR. BOGGS: So it's not two basins. It's
12 just actually one that has a --

13 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It's one piece.

14 And then that's what I had for fillsite 1,
15 landfill 2.

16 MS. CHEEVER: I was wondering. What does
17 it look like now? Does it look like what you had in
18 August?

19 MS. FANELLI: It's pretty close. This was
20 at the beginning of September. I think at this point,
21 they've got all the rock in place and the channel.

22 The last pour for the -- basically we're
23 there. The only thing that's not done is getting the
24 irrigation piping and trench pretty much sealed up.

25 We're going to put in some rock in the

1 fillsite 1 parking area. That's not completed, and then
2 the planting, and the planting spec is out on the street.

3 It was pre-bid -- bid walk last week. I
4 didn't attend it, but we have four parties, I believe,
5 that are interested and say they're going to bid, and
6 we've asked them to do the construction between October
7 15th and December 15th.

8 So that's the plan, to have this thing
9 pretty much planted by the winter.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Has there -- has
11 anybody raised any issues around the safety of the
12 retention pond? Like people falling in?

13 MS. FANELLI: No, they have not. Not --
14 we had that concern when it was a deeper pond last
15 winter. That's one reason we had it fenced.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: I can't really tell how
17 deep it is.

18 MS. FANELLI: I can't tell you, either. I
19 don't have a good idea of that.

20 This theoretically is not on a path. It's
21 not accessible. You have to kind of go off the path to
22 get down to it.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: This area is not
24 available to people yet, though?

25 MS. MONAGHAN: No.

1 MS. FANELLI: No.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: When is it going to open?

3 MS. FANELLI: That's a good question.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Is there a date yet?

5 MS. FANELLI: You know, we wanted to get
6 it open sooner rather than later, but definitely as soon
7 as EBI is complete, and I'm hoping that that is -- it
8 should have been by now, but I'm hoping it's no later
9 than a couple weeks from now.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: So it will open before the
11 planting work is done?

12 MS. FANELLI: That's -- that's sort of our
13 thought.

14 We think that the planting can occur while
15 the trails are open.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

17 MS. FANELLI: The contractor will go out
18 and do what they need to do. They won't need as much
19 staging and space. They will bring materials in in
20 smaller trucks.

21 On landfill E. Landfill E, we started
22 with -- back in July with removal of the mulch that had
23 been placed on the site.

24 They were replaced several feet of mulch
25 from trees that had been removed from the chipping. That

1 material was taken off and disposed of, several
2 truckloads.

3 And then they began their site grading. So
4 this is really just early on when the contractor was
5 mobilizing, starting to begin to pushing material around.

6 We did do the sewer project. I didn't
7 bring any photographs of that. I didn't have any good
8 ones that showed the sewer relocation, but we did
9 relocate a sanitary sewer line, put in some new laterals
10 from a couple of the houses and new line that was outside
11 of the landfill footprint.

12 The old line was in the footprint, and so
13 we could do all of this work without touching the
14 landfill itself and hook it up and bring that on live,
15 and then we just abandoned the sewer line in place.

16 Here's where they are beginning to grade
17 the north face of landfill E. So it's starting to take
18 on that -- that neat construction appearance, the soils
19 being cut and shoved around.

20 You can see we are fairly close to some of
21 the houses. Our neighbors have been a little crabby, but
22 overall very understanding of the work that needs to be
23 done.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: So is that fence only six
25 feet tall or is it taller?

1 MS. FANELLI: I think it's a standard
2 fence, standard chain link fence. Is that a six foot
3 tall fence? I'm pretty sure it is.

4 We had one little discovery there. We
5 found a cannonball. Didn't slow it down too much.
6 Travis -- this was fortunate. It happened on a Friday,
7 as it always does, but it happened at 9:30 in the morning
8 instead of 4:30 in the afternoon.

9 Travis was able to pick up the cannonball
10 and take it away.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: They didn't blow it up?

12 MS. FANELLI: They didn't blow this one
13 up.

14 MR. BOGGS: Where was it found? It looks
15 like it was on the surface.

16 MS. FANELLI: It got picked up as they
17 were moving some material. They placed that material and
18 it rolled out.

19 MR. BOGGS: Probably gave them sufficient
20 information to decide they didn't need to blow it up in
21 place.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: If it can roll around?

23 MR. BOGGS: If it can be backed up.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Did they have any idea what
25 date it was?

1 MS. FANELLI: I didn't get that feedback.
2 I'm the one that called Travis and Travis did respond,
3 but I didn't ask him how old this one was.

4 This is the face and what you see here is
5 the gas collection piping being installed. So on the
6 face of the landfill, we have trenches that are rock-
7 lined with perforated pipe that are going in vertically.

8 They connect to a header pipe, then takes
9 it up and vents it and connects to the surface gas
10 collection, which is a mesh system.

11 We did this as we discussed before on the
12 slope because it will facilitate deeper rooted plants and
13 planting, and it won't disturb the gas collection system.

14 There's the close-up. This one's on the
15 surface of the landfill. So there are -- some of these
16 pipes that will connect now and then vent, but over the
17 majority of the surface, you'll see there's actually a
18 geo-composite that will serve as the collection system.

19 This is soil from the Miller Road site. So
20 you can see the location in East Bay MUD's protected
21 watershed for their soil stockpiles, and that brown soil,
22 which is actually quite nice, is what we are bringing in.

23 As we've been processing it -- because we
24 did screen it -- we've been happy that there hasn't been
25 a lot of rock or other material in here. So we're

1 feeling very good about the quality.

2 It is expensive to bring it in because it's
3 coming from a distance and we've had the process it, but
4 it's nice stuff.

5 East Bay MUD's been good to work with, and
6 fortunately Gwen's been very positive and working with
7 East Bay MUD.

8 MR. BOGGS: What place are they screening
9 it to?

10 MS. FANELLI: I'm not positive. It's in
11 the spec for --

12 MR. BOGGS: Just curious.

13 MS. FANELLI: So this soil is what will be
14 amended, and we'll be in several of the planting
15 locations.

16 Although where we have Presidio soil,
17 source soils, which we don't have a lot of, we are
18 putting that in the creek channels and the forest zone of
19 landfill E to the extent we can, and when we're out of
20 material that we are onsite, we are using this material,
21 and this material is all on the face. It will all be the
22 cover of the site.

23 There we are filling trucks. These are the
24 types of trucks that we have been bringing in from East
25 Bay MUD.

1 Here is the geo-composite gas and water
2 control being installed, the fabric is several layers.
3 You can see it going across the top of the landfill. You
4 can see one of the drainage swales off to the side, off
5 in the distance.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I was wondering. Since
7 this is going in, did they deal with that pipe that had
8 gone under the landfill, the drainage pipe?

9 MS. FANELLI: They did, and it was
10 abandoned in place, and I'm not -- I'd have to go back
11 and double-check what our specs said, if they pumped
12 something into it to fill it up.

13 I think they did, but that was disconnected
14 and abandon in place.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: That would be just
16 interesting to know what they did since it was just an
17 issue. That would really be kind of interesting --

18 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: -- in our minds if the
20 whole thing was completely filled or if it was blocked
21 periodically or -- that would be.

22 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Something on each end,
24 maybe.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Right. If it was

1 completely filled, then it would be not a conduit for
2 anything else, so --

3 MS. FANELLI: Well, certainly its
4 connections on either event have been broken on the
5 landfill so it's no longer a conduit that way.

6 This is just a picture of the fabric going
7 across the top. This is the HDPE liner that's beneath
8 the drainage swales that's being installed in the low
9 flow channels.

10 So this is just to make sure we don't have
11 infiltration into waste.

12 Another picture, cover soils beginning to
13 be placed. And that's what I have for landfill E.

14 So landfill E is moving along. They're not
15 really behind schedule. They are projecting a
16 substantial completion date sometime the first week in
17 October.

18 We're looking for ways to double up
19 activities and to certainly have the drainage done before
20 that.

21 So that if there is an early rain, we're in
22 good shape for them to get back out there and finish
23 things up and also to control water onsite.

24 So that's moving along. The critical path
25 for landfill E is the import of soil. It just takes --

1 they don't have a lot of space to store. They don't have
2 a lot of places to store at the watershed, either, so
3 they're processing a couple of days' worth and then
4 loading it out and processing.

5 But that is right now our critical path is
6 getting the cover soil in.

7 Here on building 228, I don't actually have
8 a photograph of the drilling. What you can see here are
9 the rows on the top that were drilled and they installed
10 these -- I don't know. I want to call them electrodes,
11 but it's where the electricity goes in to heat up the
12 soil, to get the resistance to heat up the soil.

13 We made a decision -- the contractor made a
14 decision to cover that surface to help keep heat trapped
15 in, because it's a shallower treatment zone, and it's
16 completely fenced all the way around.

17 There's another angle view of it.

18 MR. BOGGS: What was the manifold along
19 the bottom on the trees? Yeah. The white along the
20 bottom, all the little -- it looks like valves.

21 Is there an extraction involved?

22 MS. FANELLI: Right. There is extraction.
23 So what they do is the electricity goes into the earth.
24 It heats it up through resistance to a hundred degrees C
25 and there's vapor that's collected and it's run to a

1 burner and then it's released.

2 There's also a fair amount of
3 instrumentation in there. They have temperature
4 monitoring probes in all of these holes and moisture
5 probes.

6 I know you asked for a presentation on
7 this, and I think we're targeting October, maybe November
8 with Mike Beck to come out, and at that point, we'll have
9 run the system for a couple of months and he'll actually
10 have some good data to talk about how it performed.

11 MS. GEE: How long does it last, the
12 treatment?

13 MS. FANELLI: The system's supposed to
14 operate at least three months, maybe four. It got turned
15 on I believe the beginning of August.

16 So they're going to do their first sampling
17 in the latter part of October to see if we've met some of
18 our cleanup objectives, and then they'll run it longer as
19 necessary.

20 I forget what the heck that is. There's
21 the cooling tower. There's the -- that's the --

22 MR. BOGGS: Water/air separator.

23 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. This is what burns
24 it. This is the -- but that's not the right word. I'm
25 spacing the right word.

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thermal something.

2 MS. FANELLI: The oxidizer.

3 MS. CHEEVER: I apologize for asking such
4 a basic question, but since I missed the last meeting,
5 what is it that's being vaporized?

6 MS. FANELLI: It's the Stoddard solvents.
7 So the building above was the dry cleaners.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

9 MS. FANELLI: There's some diesel fuel and
10 there's some solvent in the ground.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Thank you.

12 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

13 So it's fenced. It's all electrified and
14 it shuts off automatically if anybody tampers with the
15 fence or tries to go in there.

16 We haven't had -- I think we had one
17 incidence where the fence got breached, and I'm not even
18 sure -- it was a false alarm. They responded
19 immediately.

20 It's run by telemetry. The operator is
21 watching it carefully.

22 I have a couple more sites. I have the
23 slope repair. This is kind of an interesting one because
24 I had four pictures, but two of them are black and white.

25 This is a big crane. This is where we had

1 the two kind of small sloughs that occurred last winter
2 and we had to repair them, so ERRG did that repair, and
3 basically the repair they did it was kind of by hand and
4 a large crane that dropped the soil over.

5 We had a small stockpile and still had a
6 little dribble left of the Napa brown, and they amended
7 it per the recipe that we had before and then dropped it
8 over and dropped it by crane.

9 So there's a large crane that dropped
10 buckets of soil. There's the bag of soil coming down the
11 slope to the repair area, and the guys -- this is one of
12 those black and white photos. I didn't know why they did
13 it in black and white.

14 The guys did hand work. That's another one
15 where they placed it. They had a compactor and they
16 compacted it in place, and the last one is the repaired
17 slope. So the two areas were done.

18 The original -- they didn't have to really
19 do much in here. This was just a slide, but the hole
20 basically that they had to fill was here and this one was
21 basically down in here.

22 So those are scheduled to be planted in
23 October. We have a contractor that did the original
24 irrigation -- will come out and plant those plants.
25 Probably in the October time frame.

1 We want to wait for some rain to wet it,
2 but I don't want it until we're buttoned up on 1 and 2
3 and E, so I've kind of got this -- I don't want to, but I
4 kind of go until we get this done.

5 So that was the slope repair.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Can -- are you
7 satisfied that people know why that happened and that
8 this repair will not just break again because they fixed
9 the underlying problem, or is that known?

10 Did that just fail because it just happened
11 to be a weak part of the slope or --

12 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We actually had the
13 design engineers come out and do an evaluation, so there
14 is a memo that was sent to both DTSC -- I think that Rob
15 was copied on it -- that described what the cause was.

16 And it wasn't a fundamental flaw in the
17 construction. It's a large slope, and I think the issue
18 was variations, localized variations in compaction.

19 So you had maybe a less compacted portion
20 on a tighter portion, water backed up and it just
21 basically flowed. That was some of the analysis.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Have you done anything
24 for the up top, the larger repair there where you've got
25 the French drain and evidence of overdropping?

1 MS. FANELLI: I don't think there was any
2 evidence of overtopping when these two events occurred.
3 We put the French drain in there as a precaution. The
4 French drain is still in place.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I've expressed some
6 concern that that may be contributing.

7 MS. FANELLI: It was put in, put in after
8 in case there was water up there that was --

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right.

10 MS. FANELLI: -- in the saturated soil
11 coming down.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Now it will go deeper.
13 It will go into the French drain and percolate into the
14 cover rather quickly.

15 MS. FANELLI: The French drain is piped.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: I know.

17 MS. FANELLI: It's piped down.

18 We had no movement or changes after those
19 two little boils. So we feel the slope is behaving all
20 right.

21 And we will talk about the drain on top,
22 whether or not it's necessary anymore or it can be
23 abandoned.

24 But I do understand what you're saying. I
25 don't think we observed that phenomenon during the rest

1 of the winter.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Can I ask you a question
3 about landfill 10 and 8?

4 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. CHEEVER: When I last went up there
6 two days ago, planting has grown since that picture.
7 Maybe it's a question for you, Brian.

8 The plants are dominated -- there's a
9 sickle plant that dominates the slopes. It's a tall
10 spiky plant that maybe has teeny little white blossoms.

11 Is that a native plant or invasive plant?
12 It's on landfill 8, as well.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know. They just
14 did weeding out there.

15 MS. CHEEVER: My walk was out there Sunday
16 evening. Whatever this is is prolific.

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is it pretty?

18 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah. It's also nice to see
19 so much grown there. I worry a little -- I don't know.
20 I'd just like to know if that's meant to believe.

21 MS. FANELLI: I don't actually know the
22 species they planted on 8. They were planting it slowly,
23 but I presume it would all be natives and not anything
24 that was innovative.

25 MS. CHEEVER: Unless there's something

1 that's just growing like wildflower. It's the same plant
2 on both 8 and 10.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: There are some --

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: They're teeny white
5 flowers?

6 MS. CHEEVER: Teeny white flowers. Does
7 heather have any teeny white flowers?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know. That's
9 enough description.

10 MS. CHEEVER: It's just tall with a lot of
11 leaves growing out. They're not sharp spiky. Just --
12 yeah.

13 MS. FANELLI: So end of August, beginning
14 of September, we also did some sampling at Baker Beach 2,
15 and this is just a handful of pictures of the excavator
16 that went out.

17 We sampled two areas, the metals recycling
18 area. I didn't have any photographs of that. It was
19 just hand samples, and we did some trenches to try to get
20 samples to characterize the debris fill and the extent.

21 So a few test pits, some examples of the
22 debris that we found.

23 This is a picture of where a couple of
24 those test pits were on the slope and some erosion
25 control fabric. It's all biodegradable that was placed

1 back after the test pits were backfilled. So very few
2 pictures there.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: When this was -- was
4 this to determine the edges or the contents or --

5 MS. FANELLI: It was pretty much to get
6 samples for the content. We only had I think between
7 four, six samples of the debris fill after we pulled all
8 the data together.

9 So there wasn't enough to characterize the
10 debris, and it was an attempt to characterize it and
11 understand it.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

13 MS. FANELLI: In terms of schedule, we are
14 still working on that remedial construction report for
15 RAP 4 and hopefully it's getting itself into shape. It's
16 been a little bit of a slowing.

17 CHP range is our outstanding site. We were
18 trying to construct this year, but realized that there's
19 some additional assessment from historical perspective to
20 understand the fabric.

21 So we've delayed construction till 2012,
22 but we are working on a work plan in conjunction with Leo
23 Barker and the cultural folks at Park Service to better
24 understand the cultural resource before we begin the
25 excavation.

1 At the same time, we're collecting some
2 additional samples to try to bound and characterize it.

3 So we're doing a work plan amendment
4 basically to document that, and that should be prepared
5 shortly and off to Park Service for review and then to
6 DTSC.

7 On 5A, 1 and 2, we're very close to being
8 completely done and then plant.

9 1A, you saw that we've submitted a Draft RI
10 to DTSC. So that is under review, and we are working on
11 the Draft FS/RAP.

12 We're hoping to get -- we're a little bit
13 behind on that hoping to get a draft out in the next
14 couple weeks to Park Service, and then once that is
15 reviewed, it will go to DTSC.

16 Landfill E, we're hoping to be done soon.
17 There would be no second year grading, simply planting
18 the next year.

19 We would -- because the soil's coming from
20 offsite, we will probably do some -- we wouldn't do any
21 planting this year.

22 We'll mulch to try to prevent any weed
23 seeds from growing, and anything that does grow we'll
24 likely spray and kill or somehow try to abate the weeds
25 that are in there by getting rid of them this first

1 season prior to planting next year, and I got the date in
2 there wrong. I have 2102 instead of 2012.

3 Baker Beach 2, you saw that we had the work
4 plan that had been submitted and we completed the
5 sampling earlier in September.

6 As soon as we get all those results, we're
7 going to be working on the Draft RI that incorporates
8 that data.

9 Battery Howe Wagner and 6B, we sent
10 comments back to Amec to complete sort of the summary, RI
11 of all the work that's been done out there and based on
12 the data gaps.

13 Those are in progress and hopefully will be
14 done in the next several.

15 Mountain Lake, we submitted the draft to
16 DTSC. We're beginning to work on the FS/RAP, and I know
17 there's a meeting that DTSC has called with Friends of
18 Mountain Lake and some other groups. I'm sure you guys
19 have been invited.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Actually, I haven't
21 heard of the meeting.

22 MS. FANELLI: Well, let me follow up.
23 It's been set up with Friends of Mountain Lake. So
24 Rhadika has been working with Friends of Mountain Lake.
25 It's set for Monday the 26th at seven o'clock.

1 It's sort of a planning meeting, if you
2 will, for what DTSC anticipates is a regular public
3 meeting and discussion to occur more in the November time
4 frame.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: That's definitely good
6 to know.

7 Location for the meeting?

8 MS. FANELLI: I think it's supposed to be
9 the Golden Gate Club. I'll have to check with Genevieve.

10 But I know -- I forget the woman's name
11 from Friends of Mountain Lake. Is it Kate that she's
12 been working with?

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

14 MS. FANELLI: 937, Ford Construction is
15 going to be doing the work and they're supposed to begin
16 October 5th.

17 207/231, the in situ is in process and
18 we're hoping to do sort of the final excavation in the
19 231 area May through October.

20 We're still trying to coordinate with the
21 Doyle Drive P3 group and their plans in that area, but
22 that would be our target to get that -- the big
23 excavation done.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: It will run later than
25 October, though, because they didn't really start till

1 August and that says May.

2 Is that right?

3 MS. FANELLI: Oh. That's not for --

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh. That's not --

5 MS. FANELLI: My slide doesn't make a lot

6 of sense.

7 The excavation work --

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, okay.

9 MS. FANELLI: -- is scheduled for May.

10 This is wrong, too. It should say 2012.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, next year.

12 MS. FANELLI: So my -- I didn't change it.

13 My mistake.

14 Lead-based paint. I don't actually have

15 all the total numbers. That's really moving along. I

16 think we submitted approximately 250 buildings,

17 residential and non-residential for no further action.

18 I think DTSC has concurred on at least 200

19 of them if not more. That program's moving along fairly

20 well, although we still have several buildings left to

21 continue to process, but -- Nina has gotten that going.

22 So next quarter, we're going to plant.

23 We're going to finish E and winterize. Hopefully we'll

24 have a preliminary draft for the FS draft for Baker Beach

25 1A.

1 We'll have the Draft RI for Baker Beach 2,
2 and we'll submit a data summary, which will likely be the
3 Draft RI for Battery Howe Wagner.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is the quarter
5 ending in three weeks?

6 MS. FANELLI: In three weeks, preliminary
7 draft for Baker Beach 1A might be a little bit later than
8 that.

9 We'll have the data back, so we'll have the
10 data report for Baker Beach 2. I know that we've gotten
11 some of the data back, but -- whether or not we have the
12 Draft RI.

13 Angela is working with Mary Jo at Mactec on
14 those to get -- get it moved along faster.

15 Under petroleum, basically we're not really
16 in a holding pattern until Agnes comes back, but she did
17 ask us to grab a couple of additional samples
18 downgradient of former tank 1213.1 to confirm that we had
19 limited impacts based on historical data from the Army.

20 We are working on that. John Dewitt is
21 leading those efforts, and we're hoping to continue the
22 design for that.

23 We're hoping that the building 231 site
24 will be completed next spring. Basically we have the
25 design done, so it's really can we get the work done at

1 Doyle so we can proceed.

2 On the lead-based paint, we're going to
3 submit closures.

4 Everybody's busy. You can get a sense of
5 all of the photographs. Everybody's working pretty hard
6 and pretty focused to move things along.

7 And that's all I have.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you. Thank you
9 for preparing all that and bringing the photos. Those
10 photos are much appreciated.

11 There is a -- I guess an item of new
12 business that I wanted to bring to everyone's attention
13 as we look forward. Now there's much less time than when
14 we started in 1994.

15 2014 is about two -- if we say May, I think
16 that's the insurance policy expiration, as I recall.

17 MS. FANELLI: The RSL policy expires May
18 2014 and that's for all -- basically all costs incurred.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

20 MS. FANELLI: For the RSL -- that is --
21 excuse me. For the REEL policy, it's a claims made and
22 we do have the option of a three-year extension on that
23 for a fixed amount of money if the Trust decides that
24 they want to do.

25 I don't think they've made that decision

1 yet.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: It's been occurring to
3 me that we're kind of nearing the end, perhaps, of a long
4 journey and perhaps with that amount of time, looking out
5 May 2014, it might not be too soon to be thinking about
6 how we would collect everything together that -- all the
7 achievements, look over what happened, who did what,
8 begin to put together some kind of story of what happened
9 over this time forever.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: We have just the author.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: That's right. That's
12 right.

13 I'm just putting that out there because,
14 you know, around this table, as I look around the table,
15 these are the people that have really been there from --
16 almost from day one, and to think that it might be good
17 for us to maybe write a story somehow of our impressions,
18 thoughts, find photos, see if we want to have some kind
19 of celebration, think if we want to -- whatever it might
20 be.

21 Maybe it would be six months of celebrate
22 being. Who knows? I don't know.

23 But we have -- given how long we've been
24 doing this, there's a lot out there, and it would be kind
25 of cool to put that together.

1 Along those lines, also this is a -- one of
2 our regular RAB meetings, and given -- you know, possibly
3 because of the late changing date, there might be a
4 tendency for us -- well, it's the end of the program,
5 just kind of throw in our bat and ball and go home and
6 it's all over.

7 I would -- I would rather that we think
8 about how we want to tie a bow around this, and with our
9 representation here tonight, some of it may be meeting
10 change and other just may be summertime, but we want to
11 think about how we want to bring people back together for
12 this last push, see that we dot the I's, cross the T's,
13 kind of wrap up the whole program.

14 So we have time, and I think we could do a
15 really amazing job of recording what happened. We're
16 kind of the people who did it, so we should write the
17 story.

18 So that's a big project, and I think what
19 might be most fun is to draw people back in and begin,
20 you know, spending some RAB meeting time around what's --
21 what do we want to create around this.

22 So I'll put that out there as a future
23 agenda item.

24 MR. BOGGS: I think we get Bruce
25 Handelman's and Roger Henderson's numbers for you.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm sure that they'd
2 come back and have a few things to say. Maybe David
3 Wilkins is out there to speak to us and say, "I really
4 didn't mean to kick you off the RAB twice." Well, we'll
5 see.

6 Do you have any public comment to make,
7 Bob? Thank you so much for being here.

8 MR. BOGGS: Not tonight. Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Are there any
10 other agenda items?

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Can I ask you a question
12 about this? You bring this up.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh, please.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Has the -- in the history
15 of RABs, have they ever closed out a whole site like this
16 and done something like that? Is there examples
17 someplace or --

18 FACILITATOR KERN: I have not heard of
19 such a thing.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: They're plowing new ground
21 here.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I think so. I think
23 the idea is to understand what the Trust intends, will
24 they continue another three years past?

25 They might have to for some of the unknown

1 sites, but twenty years would certainly be a good marking
2 point.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: And -- yeah.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: Have you been thinking
6 about that?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. I haven't been
8 thinking about that.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Hard to believe.
11 Really hard to believe.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm looking at the list of
13 all the different numbers, like whoa.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I joined you guys a
15 little bit into the process. I haven't gotten to twenty
16 yet.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Do you know what year you
18 started?

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: '95.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: We hadn't been going very
21 long.

22 MS. CHEEVER: That's really the same year
23 that you and I joined, more or less. The selection
24 process dragged out. I think we may have been going to
25 meetings by December '94, but --

1 FACILITATOR KERN: That was actually -- we
2 were having a meeting every week when we first started,
3 and they would go from 7:00 till past midnight every
4 week.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: We had a lot to fight
6 about.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: It was an amazing time.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: It was very contentious
9 yeah.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: We're not doing that
11 these days.

12 MS. CHEEVER: There may be many military
13 sites where cleanup is closed. What happened to their
14 RABs?

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, that's a very
16 interesting part to look into. How many RABs still
17 exist; how many have closed.

18 I know there was movement to like disband
19 Fort Ord for a while because they were quite active,
20 shall we say, and Hunters Point has had major calamities
21 in their history, so -- yeah.

22 That can be part of the project to
23 understand the -- because it was -- the Presidio RAB I
24 think was formed right around when the presidential
25 order --

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Right.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: -- was put out.

3 We were almost immediately put together
4 right then.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: So I guess the Trust has a
6 historian. Yes, no? Somebody that does that work? I
7 don't know.

8 MR. BOGGS: I think our public
9 participation people would help with -- I think this site
10 is site's history, its political prominence I think is
11 worthy of doing something more, putting out a press
12 release, maybe --

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

14 MR. BOGGS: -- or something like that.

15 I have seen RABs that just kind of did fade
16 into oblivion like when the remedy got put into place, it
17 was like I guess our job is done, and I've seen one where
18 they had just like a pot luck little celebration, kind of
19 like a Christmas party-type deal just to culminate the
20 event.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: We have a long way to go,
22 three more years. It's not like next year we're going to
23 turn off the lights.

24 MS. GEE: It might be a nice idea to do a
25 visual memory, like an aerial view of the Presidio and

1 someone say where all the different sites are.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

3 MS. GEE: And then to zero if there's a
4 before picture and a mid and an end, you know.

5 MR. BOGGS: There's a lot of --

6 FACILITATOR KERN: We have lots of before
7 pictures.

8 MS. GEE: And then something that is sort
9 of -- gives a taste of what was involved and the
10 finishing product, you know.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

12 MR. BOGGS: Crissy Field.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

14 MS. GEE: I think with technology now,
15 with all the visual pictures, you can enhance like -- oh,
16 not tag it, but you say -- you touch whatever part of the
17 Presidio and then you can see some photos of what was
18 before, middle and end or something.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

20 MR. BOGGS: Yeah.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: There are a lot of
22 self-publishing tools. We could actually create a book
23 pretty easily with photos and -- picture book.

24 So it just seems like a project that's
25 worth talking about what kind of magnitude of a project

1 it would be and who would want to do what, and maybe we
2 can really bring people back together to the table around
3 such a project.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: I still see all the RAB
5 members around town. They're around.

6 MR. BOGGS: Like some of the exhibits they
7 have, we could create an exhibit that they put up for a
8 week or whatever of the environmental restoration at the
9 Presidio.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

11 MR. BOGGS: If you wanted to take it to
12 that --

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, of course I do,
14 but I want to see what energy there is around doing
15 something like that.

16 MS. GEE: It sounds like the first thing
17 is to do a visual picture book thing and do the
18 technology and put it in a different format for
19 posterity, right?

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

21 MS. GEE: I think if you do the hard copy,
22 it's easier.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. So that's an
24 idea. People can think about it and we can hopefully use
25 something, brainstorm about, begin to bring more people

1 back to meetings, because I'm noticing our meetings are
2 less well attended, shall we say.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: And my preference is
5 for us to decide if we're going to disband, if that's
6 what we're going to do, but not just fade away.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I think there's more
9 work to be done. There's certainly more sites to check
10 and participate in the good work that you're doing.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: So since we ask people to
12 serve for two years and some people stick around a lot
13 longer than that, is it possible that we want to do a new
14 member campaign and --

15 FACILITATOR KERN: I think that's worth
16 considering.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: To work on the last three
18 years and kind of renew some energy around it?

19 FACILITATOR KERN: I think that's
20 definitely worth considering in the event that things get
21 extended for other sites beyond 2014, that there would
22 be -- some of us may decide we want to pass the torch,
23 but in order to pass the torch, we have somebody to give
24 it to.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: So that could be part
2 of such an effort at bringing new people in.

3 It might be worth talking what your
4 department may visualize its role being past that date.
5 It may be the same.

6 There may be more things to do and the
7 continued role of the public in that. It would be good
8 to have conversations around that.

9 So some ideas for pondering. That will get
10 people back. It will give us some real things to do to
11 look back --

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: -- and see what
14 happened here.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: Well, I know there's a lot
16 of interest around Mountain Lake. So if that's going to
17 start up and people are very interested in that, so that
18 should bring more energy back to it, too.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

20 Eileen, do you know if like this meeting on
21 the 26th at 7:00, is that intended to be talking around
22 the cleanup or --

23 MS. FANELLI: Cleanup only, yeah. DTSC
24 will only speak to the remediation. So it's not about a
25 further enhancement of any other projects.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you know why they're
2 not doing that at like a RAB meeting?

3 MS. FANELLI: Well, I think that the
4 request came from the Friends of Mountain Lake, and so
5 there's an initial discussion, and I'm not sure who is --
6 it is a DTSC meeting, but my impression was that DTSC and
7 Friends of Mountain Lake were reaching out to sort of the
8 neighborhood groups, some of the broader neighborhood
9 groups just as an initial touch base.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Sure.

11 MS. FANELLI: And I kind of assumed that
12 they would have called -- called you, but it's not an
13 ignoring the RAB.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: No.

15 MS. FANELLI: I think they're still
16 planning some additional outreach meetings, definitely.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I appreciate that you
18 let us know that there was a meeting. I'm not -- I'm not
19 offended.

20 It's really just -- we have some continuity
21 of information --

22 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: -- that we've shared
24 with the Mountain Lake folks.

25 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is that the

1 agenda's not set, but it's really just an introduction to
2 the schedule.

3 The Draft RI's out, so it's sort of an
4 information exchange and planning for what is anticipated
5 to be some additional public outreach meeting --
6 meetings, even in the November time frame is what has
7 been discussed with DTSC.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Would it be your
9 recommendation that I talk to Rhadika or Denise --

10 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: -- about coming to our
12 RAB meeting?

13 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Great. So that will be
15 a great next month agenda item, Mountain Lake, see what's
16 up since we got this other meeting --

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: -- and pursue that.
19 Anything else for the good of the order
20 tonight?

21 Thanks to everyone for -- oh, yes.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: I guess if they're invited
23 to this meeting, we should put out an announcement.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh, totally.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: If people can come.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Then we'll -- I'll talk
2 to Kate, as well, and see what she has to say, and if
3 she's fine with us coming along, we'll just invade her
4 meeting. I'm sure.

5 MR. BOGGS: Put us on the agenda.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: They'll probably ask us
7 what she should ask. Anyway, yeah. That's a great idea.
8 Anything else for tonight? Thanks --

9 MS. FANELLI: I appreciate you coming to
10 building 67.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, happy to. Nice and
12 warm. There's lights.

13 MS. FANELLI: It is warm in here. It's
14 light inside and it's not echoing, so unless you guys
15 balloon, maybe this is the next several -- more
16 comfortable, to have them here as opposed to the --

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I would just say
18 if Mountain Lake becomes more of a public thing, there
19 might be more people.

20 MS. FANELLI: That's right. And then we
21 obviously go back to the Golden Gate Club.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: The Officer's Club will be
23 renovated.

24 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I don't think it will
25 be opened until 2013.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: There is some sense
2 that this is like an open public meeting, so we want
3 to -- if we're going to have it here -- kind of create a
4 way for people to know --

5 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: -- the new location.

7 MS. FANELLI: As long as the Golden Gate
8 Club is open, it's not a big deal. We can certainly go
9 back there.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Thanks for coming
11 out --

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: -- to our agency folks,
14 and so Mark, thanks for being here. And we hope that our
15 tomato crop continues to grow.

16 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

17 (The meeting concluded at 8:24 PM).

18 ---o0o---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing arbitration was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing arbitration and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2011.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2011

BUILDING 34

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Terri Thomas

Brian Ullensvang

5 Julie Cheever

Jan Blum

6 Gloria Gee

Barbara Newton

7 John Chester

Edward Callanan

8 Toni Kramer

John Budroe

9 Jan Monaghan

10

11 ---o0o---

12

13

14

15

16

17 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

18 of the Meeting, and on October 11, 2011, 7:40 PM at the

19 Building 34, Presidio of San Francisco, California,

20 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of

21 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the

22 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

23 ---o0o---

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4) Reports and Discussions - Eileen Fanelli	4
7	5) New Business -	42
8	6) Public Comment - None	
9	7) Review of Action Items:	62
10	8) Adjournment:	64

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome to our
2 regularly scheduled RAB meeting for October 2011. Not
3 necessarily our regularly scheduled place and time.
4 We're making due.

5 Does everyone have -- no one has an agenda?
6 Our name tags are over there. Now we're just visualizing
7 over here.

8 Any changes? Any announcements?

9 All right. Then we'll move on with our
10 agenda, which includes checking in on a variety of sites,
11 and given the hour, I want to try to make sure that we
12 can move through all of these things, and Mountain Lake
13 and the Barnard Range, those are kind of new items, so we
14 want to lead with those.

15 So landfill E, landfill 2, fillsite 1, I've
16 kind of been out there a little bit walking about.

17 Anything from your side? How is --

18 MS. FANELLI: Other than last months,
19 we've got the photographs of all the work that has been
20 done. We're continuing to make some progress.

21 We're looking at being complete at fillsite
22 1, landfill 2 with the temporary irrigation and some of
23 the final touches in terms of the grading work that EBI
24 is doing I believe by close to the 26th of October. The
25 last week of October.

1 We have a contract that we've finished for
2 the planting, and that's going to be with Shelter
3 Builder, Shelter Builders.

4 And we're hoping that they're going to get
5 started around next week sometime.

6 So we've issued a contract or we've
7 approved the contract and it's in the process of being
8 sent to them, and they have until December 15th to
9 complete their work. That's fillsite 1, landfill 2.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Is it still fenced off?

11 MS. FANELLI: It's still fenced off. They
12 removed the lower fence at the site of El Polin Springs
13 and they will eventually remove the remainder of the site
14 fencing.

15 They're likely going to leave up a gate by
16 the time -- I take that back. I think that the fence
17 will be completely removed. There will be some orange
18 fencing left around some of the planting areas for
19 protection.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: At landfill 2, I guess
21 there was some drainage piping or some things installed,
22 so there are a lot of vertical plastic PVC coming out of
23 the ground.

24 Do you know what the final --

25 MS. FANELLI: Those will be cut down to

1 below grade. Those are cleanouts for the drains behind
2 the terraces that are the erosion control.

3 Let me check that door, because I hear
4 somebody.

5 MS. BLUM: So that PVC will be permanent?

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, they -- what we
7 saw when they were showing the photos I think last month
8 is when -- they dug out a lot of the soil in the compost
9 that was behind all those terraces.

10 MS. BLUM: Okay.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Then they laid in new
12 perforated drainage pipe behind all the terraces.

13 So apparently the water gets in there and
14 goes in those pipes and then is kind of drained off. And
15 so there are vertical end pieces coming out of the
16 ground. It kind of looks like a forest of plastic pipes.

17 MS. FANELLI: Those pipes will be cut off
18 below grade and they're cleanouts, basically. So they
19 won't be visible when they're done.

20 MS. BLUM: They're permanent. They will
21 be there forever?

22 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: I noticed also in
24 fillsite 1 that there was a trench being cut down through
25 on the far east side and there seemed to be some kind of

1 a pot in the middle of it.

2 MS. FANELLI: That's an irrigation system.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: So the fillsites,
4 there's continuing work. There was a big rain a week or
5 so --

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Thursday.

7 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. So there's some
8 irrigation piping that's still not complete, and
9 basically it's the main line in the fillsite 1 area.
10 We've had a little bit of difficulty
11 getting their joints to seal properly. So they're
12 fussing with that pipe, so we're hoping that that's all
13 complete this week and that they backfill all of those
14 trenches.

15 There are two black pipes that you've
16 probably seen in landfill 2 coming down from either side.
17 Those are temporary. They'll be in place for probably a
18 year or until some of the plants establish themselves.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: These are big pipes on
20 either side that take water around.

21 Do I see anything else on fillsite 1,
22 landfill 2 from anyone?

23 I notice that the incinerator is like
24 prominent at the moment. It's just sitting out in the
25 middle of the site.

1 MS. FANELLI: It was placed back where the
2 historical cultural folks asked for it to be placed back.
3 So that is its permanent location.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: So that's a good place
5 to roast marshmallows.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: You could plant some ivy at
7 the bottom.

8 MS. FANELLI: I don't think there will be
9 any ivy planted. That was not under my watch. You'll
10 probably make Terri's ears buzz when you said that.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm sure.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Let's
13 see --

14 MR. BERMAN: Is there anything actually
15 being considered for the use of that?

16 MS. FANELLI: The incinerator? No. In
17 some ways, it's a decorative object. But it has
18 historical significance for the incinerator that was
19 there at the past.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm also noticing at
21 the base of landfill 2, the retention pond.

22 MS. FANELLI: Uh-huh.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: And there's a pipe, I
24 guess, that allows water to exit out of that.

25 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: And what happens to the
2 water that doesn't quite get up in there to that pipe?
3 Does it just ooze out the bottom?

4 MS. FANELLI: It just stays there. The
5 idea is that it's holding back water and releasing it at
6 the same rate before remediation was conducted.

7 So we're not changing the hydraulics, the
8 surface water flow of the area until such time as the
9 trees grow back up and the hydraulic calculations
10 indicate that because of increased evapotranspiration is
11 at the same rate that we were before or there's other
12 modifications downstream so that we're not putting more
13 water down there than can be handled.

14 That pipe is considered to be temporary,
15 but it's not necessarily a one-year temporary. It's when
16 the site is better established from a vegetation
17 standpoint.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

19 MS. FANELLI: It's kind of a Water Board
20 requirement if you were in substantial compliance with
21 their general construction permit.

22 MS. BLUM: So eventually what will be the
23 outcome for that retention pond? Will it --

24 MS. FANELLI: The idea is that it will
25 silt up a little bit. They'll plant wetland plants and

1 it will become a normal functioning wetland area.

2 Landfill E is a little bit further behind,
3 although we are predicting -- working with the
4 contractor -- basically substantial completion by the
5 third week. So they have maybe two weeks left of work
6 there.

7 We likely are not going to pave the smaller
8 parking area, replacement parking area this year. We're
9 going to winterize and come back and do that in a future
10 year, and that's because if we tried to do that, it would
11 likely push it to November and we're not interested in
12 trying the weather, pushing the weather.

13 Let me check that door.

14 MR. BERMAN: Doug, is it your
15 understanding that the puddle, the big puddle in front of
16 the pipe is just sitting on clay? Is that why it
17 puddles?

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, there's a dam
19 basically in front of it. Serpentine has a lot of clay
20 at least further up at that spot. So that's why I'm
21 guessing it's holding in the spot.

22 MS. FANELLI: So landfill E is moving
23 along, and it will be winterized at final grade with
24 everything except the pavement.

25 There we will likely put up fences -- we

1 will take down the fence that surrounds the site, but we
2 will leave a fence panel that will block vehicle traffic
3 on to the top, and that will be left at the end of
4 Barnard Avenue, and there's actually now a new entrance
5 if you go to the site off of the cul-de-sac on Quarry
6 Road by building 810, and we will leave that blocked.

7 That's where the paving will go ultimately,
8 but we're going to leave that blocked for the season.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: So we can walk there, but
10 we can't drive.

11 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

12 MR. BERMAN: So the area around the old
13 Pop Hicks Field is -- is that going to be paved?

14 MS. FANELLI: There's a small area. It
15 had asphalt there before. We've taken that up to install
16 the cover and to reestablish the western drainage.

17 We are replacing that -- a smaller piece of
18 asphalt that's sort of to the northeast above the toe of
19 the landfill, above the slope, but closer to Quarry Road.

20 MR. BERMAN: So is that just going to
21 become a field, an extension of the field, then, where
22 you're not paving it?

23 MS. FANELLI: No. We're going to pave it
24 next year. We're just putting base now as part of the
25 decision.

1 MR. BERMAN: I misunderstood.

2 MS. FANELLI: So E's coming along.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: I was wondering if
4 there are any changes as everybody got out into the field
5 and started seeing what was there.

6 MS. FANELLI: Nothing -- nothing
7 significant, no. We've simplified the design in a few
8 places. The toe discharge, there used to be some rather
9 large dissipators based on the hydraulic calculations,
10 and we were able to simplify that to some simpler rock
11 spill pads.

12 But other than that, there hasn't really
13 been any significant changes.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

15 MR. BERMAN: Just in terms of the looks,
16 when the cover is put in place, will it line up with the
17 parking lot?

18 MS. FANELLI: No. There's a grade.
19 There's a grade break there. So there's a -- you kind of
20 come in and go up. It's a little steep to where the
21 pavement which is the concept of the future parking lot.

22 We're not building a parking lot per se,
23 but we will put asphalt down that will support vehicles.
24 But we're not finishing it. We're not doing the curbs,
25 those types of things. We're not striping. Those are

1 things that are going to be left.

2 We will just leave a paved area that will
3 take future cars. There's a slight rise to a flat
4 broader area of the slope, which will ultimately be the
5 area to develop as a ballfield.

6 And then as you move toward the west is the
7 drainage channel, and that's the area that will
8 ultimately be restored with native plants, and I know
9 Terri's ordered some native plants for next year, so in
10 addition to finishing that paving, we plan on planting it
11 next season.

12 We're talking about landfill E.

13 MS. THOMAS: Figure.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I noticed there was
15 some paving on the toe of landfill E.

16 Was that material put back up on top or
17 taken away?

18 MS. FANELLI: Most of the material that
19 was waste was reused. It was cut and filled to get to
20 grade. So it was balanced.

21 There is a small amount of excess fill,
22 waste fill that we do have stockpiled under plastic that
23 will be off-hauled, but I'd estimate only about two, two
24 or three hundred yards of excess waste is going offsite.

25 The rest was balanced onsite, and that

1 excess waste really came from the margins in the back
2 where we were excavating and getting a deeper section for
3 planting for roots is where that came from.

4 MR. BERMAN: So has the access from the
5 residences above there changed, also?

6 MS. FANELLI: Unh-unh. To the play -- to
7 the ballfield? No, it has not.

8 MR. BERMAN: So that walkway that has been
9 there forever --

10 MS. FANELLI: Is still there.

11 MR. BERMAN: -- remains?

12 MS. FANELLI: That's correct. And then
13 our access road, I believe it's been narrowed
14 significantly. It won't be a vehicle road. It will
15 ultimately be a trail that connects to Quarry Trail.

16 So we are hoping to have the fences down on
17 that site by November 1, except for the two panels that
18 will block vehicles getting off to the site, and then we
19 will not be planting it this year, but we have it
20 completely covered with fabric and mulch and we're
21 actually going to spend the year monitoring it and
22 killing weeds or any other plants that grow for the first
23 season, and then plant it next year.

24 MR. BERMAN: And the drainage -- where
25 does that all drain off? Does it drain to the south?

1 MS. FANELLI: It all drains to the north.

2 MR. BERMAN: The north, I mean, right.

3 MS. FANELLI: Yes. It all drains to the
4 north, and goes from the east or the west side down to
5 the toe and discharges down through what we call
6 currently Barnard Avenue Protected Range and then
7 ultimately to the creek and out as part of Tennessee
8 Hollow.

9 MR. BERMAN: Is that expected, then, to
10 have more flow than it does now where it meets the creek?

11 MS. FANELLI: I think we're expecting more
12 flow because a lot of water in the past was actually
13 infiltrating into landfill E to that broken pipe.

14 And because we corrected that, I think
15 we'll see more surface water flow, yes, come down through
16 the site.

17 MS. BLUM: I'm not sure I'm following the
18 drainage. Right now the water goes into the street and
19 puddles -- I don't know which direction it is, the north
20 end of Quarry Road. There's a lot of water. It's a
21 downhill slope, as I recall.

22 So is it going to go into a pipe on this
23 side of the street, on the landfill E side of the street?

24 MS. FANELLI: No.

25 MS. BLUM: There's a lot of water that

1 settles down on Quarry Road and whatever that steep hill
2 coming down from -- we need a map.

3 MS. FANELLI: The drainage comes -- let me
4 get me -- landfill E here. So drainage that comes down
5 this hillside area or comes down the trail.

6 Some of the drainage used to go right down
7 Quarry Road and it still does and it discharges through
8 the storm drain system here.

9 Some of these storm drains on this street
10 actually discharge to the top of landfill E.

11 So that discharge still exists. We didn't
12 change that. We're collecting that in a drainage along
13 the eastern side. It comes down to the edge here.

14 It does go into a pipe and the pipe
15 daylights at the toe of the landfill cap and then it
16 discharging down the creek channel here.

17 There's a swale along the backside and
18 there's a drainage, a natural drainage on this side. The
19 backside of the landfill swale and this upstream drainage
20 converge here in the southwest corner, and then there's a
21 new surface drainage along the western side.

22 It also discharges into a pipe at the face
23 of the landfill, and then daylights at the toe on to a
24 rock pad, and then all that water comes down into the
25 tributary.

1 So we didn't change the hydraulics, but I
2 do expect there to be a bit more water flow, because it's
3 not infiltrating as much into the landfill itself.

4 MR. BERMAN: And a real heavy rain, that
5 will be quite a little river, then, going there. And
6 it's calculated that even in a heavy rainstorm, it won't
7 flood out over the bridge and that whole area where it
8 connects down?

9 MS. FANELLI: No. It's designed to hold
10 the hundred year flows. So it shouldn't. It shouldn't
11 flood.

12 MR. BERMAN: So the construction of all of
13 that, that's part of the -- the restoration?

14 MS. FANELLI: The could have, yes. It is.
15 To control water, keep it away from the landfill.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Let's see if we
17 can --

18 MS. FANELLI: 228.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

20 MS. FANELLI: 228, we need -- I actually
21 have a few notes on 228 to share with you.

22 I'm hoping that in November that I will
23 actually have the contractor TSR here, and either Ryan
24 Seilbach will join me or Mike Beck or both, and they will
25 actually give you a more detailed rundown to tell you

1 what's going on at 228.

2 But I think we're considering ourselves
3 about fifty percent complete based on the energy usage to
4 date. The system has been operating as -- as designed.

5 We were getting -- based on our gas
6 influent and effluent readings through the oxidizer, the
7 oxidizer is operating at the efficiency required by the
8 airborne permit, which is like 97, 98 percent, so it's
9 burning the Stoddard solvent off.

10 I heard over the weekend there were --
11 there was a complaint from somebody about noise from the
12 facility, and I think there was a loose belt that has
13 since been repaired and fixed, but the system is
14 monitored routinely remotely by the contractor, and then
15 there are weekly inspections, physical inspections of the
16 site, as well.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Did you --

18 MR. BERMAN: Can you remind me from 228
19 is?

20 MS. FANELLI: Yes. It's right above the
21 historic wall in what will be the Quartermaster Reach
22 area. Terri can point it out there.

23 MS. BLUM: You know Halleck Street, Sam?

24 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

25 MS. BLUM: It's almost at the corner of

1 that and Burgos.

2 MS. FANELLI: The plan is at about seventy
3 or eighty percent complete or we think that's where we're
4 at.

5 The work plan that was approved by the
6 Water Board includes sections of soil samples. So AMEC,
7 Mike Beck's company, will do that, and that's scheduled
8 for either the last week of October or first week of
9 November.

10 So we may not have analytical data for you
11 at the November meeting, but we'll have an update of what
12 they've observed in terms of its operations.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Besides the noise thing
14 that you mentioned, have you gotten anything about
15 smells, any complaints?

16 MS. FANELLI: We haven't gotten any
17 complaints. There was a report of a burning smell, and
18 actually TSR -- actually they thought that that was
19 related to the belt, but I haven't gotten any -- any
20 complaints about odors.

21 I know that they have monitored -- because
22 of the burning smell, they have been monitoring and it's
23 part of their work plan -- all the perimeters, ambients,
24 and nothing has come up unusual, and they have collected
25 two rounds of actual gas samples that are quantitatively

1 analyzed, and the most recent one just came back today
2 and that was all within operating parameters.

3 But I have heard about sort of a burning
4 smell.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: There was actually some
6 folks at the Crissy Field Center going home that way
7 everyday and they walked that way, so they mentioned it
8 to me.

9 I went by one day and you could smell
10 something.

11 MS. FANELLI: Something.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: It wasn't like and you
13 would fall over dead or something, but it did strike
14 you -- and it was quite an acrid kind of an odor.

15 So you would think the people living right
16 there would have said something.

17 MS. FANELLI: We haven't gotten any calls
18 from anybody that -- that lives in the area. But I will
19 ask Ryan who works with TSR to see if they have any
20 information on -- I know what -- I heard about what was
21 described as a burning smell -- and I haven't smelled it
22 myself -- I don't know if that's just something that's
23 part of the operation of the machine or what, but I do
24 know that all of our monitoring has been ongoing per the
25 plan.

1 At this point, we haven't seen anything
2 that said there's a problem with its function.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: This was about a month
4 ago.

5 MS. FANELLI: Okay. All right. Well,
6 I'll look into -- I'll look into that and make sure they
7 address it when they come to talk.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: So when they do their
9 monitoring, are they able to test the contaminants
10 remaining as this process is going on or does that have
11 to be done after all the equipment is removed?

12 MS. FANELLI: No. I think they're going
13 to sample the soil and equipment in place. They're going
14 to sample in situ and that makes the determination how
15 much longer they need the machine.

16 But they're using their indirects. They've
17 actually started to see a drop in the total volume of the
18 material being sucked out of the ground, which is I think
19 what they hoped to see.

20 It peeks and starts to come down. That's an
21 indication that it seems to be working and we should be
22 cleaning it up and removing the greater portion of the
23 mast. And then they do ambient monitoring around the
24 facility.

25 MR. BOGGS: Those are usually stealth

1 monitor and closer, and with the sucking, they actually
2 have to add more propane or whatever they use to help
3 combust it.

4 One I did in Santa Clara was radiation gas.
5 We actually had to bleed in ambient air at first because
6 it was too high in vapors.

7 So they got down to where it was just
8 running on its on own, and then towards the end, we
9 actually added propane to oxidize it.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: I know we had all these
11 questions about this machine with all the electrical
12 probes and how much energy it would use and all that kind
13 of.

14 It just seems like that will be really
15 fascinating to see if there were issues with groundwater,
16 you know, if that had any impact on the system. I'm just
17 really curious how that whole thing works.

18 MS. FANELLI: Well, I think it's supposed
19 to get the ground up to a hundred degrees C to vaporize
20 any of the contaminants out of there.

21 So they are condensing and separating out
22 water from their waste stream.

23 They've used 261,000 kilowatts of
24 electricity so far, and that's about half of what the
25 total expected energy use is to get the site cleaned up.

1 So that's how they're measuring where they are and
2 helping to measure where they are in the process.

3 MR. BERMAN: Do those electrodes ever
4 break on the job?

5 MS. FANELLI: I don't think so. Because I
6 think they themselves are pretty simple. They're just --
7 an electrode is shot in the ground.

8 I think all the wiring and piping up above
9 is what they worry about and protect, and they have it
10 all telemetry on it, and if there's any like a raccoon or
11 somebody breaks in the system, it alarms itself and shuts
12 down automatically, and that -- I think they did get one
13 rattle at one point early on in early September where the
14 system did shut down, and I'm not sure what the cause of
15 it was. But it did function.

16 MR. CHESTER: So it is a vapor extraction
17 through this heating with electrodes?

18 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

19 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

20 MR. BERMAN: So these electrodes get used
21 over and over again. They take them to another job?

22 MS. FANELLI: I imagine they do that. I
23 don't think the rest of the system is shot, gets reused
24 necessarily.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else on that

1 site?

2 MR. BERMAN: Are you -- in the historical
3 development of the remediation, is this particular
4 mechanism being photographed so there will be some --
5 because it's one of the unusual remediation measures that
6 have been considered here.

7 I mean, and it's quite different from
8 hauling stuff away and from a cover and it has a -- it
9 looks a little exotic.

10 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

11 MR. BERMAN: It would be nice -- I don't
12 know if you're developing a historical record, but this
13 is unusual enough that a half a dozen good pictures I
14 think would be worthwhile to have them on record.

15 MS. FANELLI: We do, and I should add that
16 the company that's our vendor is actually putting on a
17 presentation about the system and then operating a field
18 trip, and I believe it's in early November, and they've
19 said that it's open to the public.

20 So I'll get you that information, because
21 if you would like to attend. I think they're actually
22 renting like a correspondence room in one of the hotels
23 nearby in the Marina or downtown and then bringing folks
24 over to see it.

25 So I will get you all that information, and

1 if you're interested in attending -- and that should be a
2 good opportunity to -- to get the skinny.

3 We'll still do a presentation at the RAB
4 meeting, but it's about the same time frame. They want
5 to couple that presentation, which is a business
6 development for them, with coming here to -- to talk.

7 So -- but I've been told that you are all
8 invited to that presentation.

9 MR. BERMAN: So there will be presentation
10 material which will consist of some photographs of the
11 in-place effort?

12 MS. FANELLI: Sure. I believe -- I'll ask
13 Mike Beck. He was out there or his company was out there
14 when they were installing electrodes.

15 I just have a couple of the system in
16 place, but he likely has pictures of it actually being
17 installed.

18 So I'll get you that information.

19 Next site --

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Just one other question
21 came up about the cost of the electricity.

22 Do we have any idea what that --

23 MS. FANELLI: I don't have that number,
24 but I do know that we are tracking it because remediation
25 is paying for that and it's considered an allowable cost

1 to operate the system.

2 So we actually have gone and placed a
3 separate meter. It was a little out of normal for the
4 Trust.

5 We've metered this particular unit and it
6 will be billed at the Trust's regular electrical rates
7 that they bill any tenant for delivery of electricity.

8 MR. BERMAN: Yeah, but it's -- it's also
9 is a big -- a big demand factor because -- I mean, you
10 use that many kilowatt hours, but it's a lot of
11 kilowatts.

12 So presumably it comes under PG&E's rate
13 that charges both for kilowatt hours and a demand charge.

14 It's being -- it's being drawn from PG&E;
15 right?

16 MS. FANELLI: I believe most of our power,
17 yeah. The Trust gets it and then distributes it
18 internally to the Presidio.

19 So we base our internal rates on the cost
20 of that electricity and on our maintenance of the -- of
21 the system and distribution.

22 MR. BERMAN: So is PG&E giving it a
23 special rate or is it just going as a --

24 MS. FANELLI: I don't think so.

25 MS. NEWTON: What does that mean, Sam, on

1 demand? An additional charge above and beyond additional
2 consumption?

3 MR. BERMAN: If you have a big building in
4 downtown San Francisco, you may pay seventeen cents a
5 kilowatt hour for your kilowatt hours, but when that
6 building operates, it may be a megawatt of power.

7 And so PG&E feels that they have to -- they
8 have to have a system that can supply that much power
9 demand, so those buildings pay not only a kilowatt hour
10 charge, they pay a demand charge based on the actual
11 power in the system. It's sort of like this.

12 MS. NEWTON: But they're feeding into your
13 building just in case you need it. It's giving you the
14 ability to get so much power even if you don't need it.

15 MR. BERMAN: PG&E says we have to have a
16 plant that will meet your demand for a certain amount of
17 kilowatts, period.

18 MR. BUDROE: But the Presidio's probably
19 got a contract with PG&E. So none of that would
20 necessarily come into play.

21 MR. BERMAN: That's what I was asking.

22 MS. FANELLI: And I don't know the details
23 of how we purchase our electricity. I know that this
24 unit is metered and we're paying the unit rate, but I'll
25 answer that question. I'll find that out for you.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

2 MR. BUDROE: Because one question I would
3 have with that, if you're charging at the tenant rate,
4 does the Presidio pay the same rate internally for
5 electricity or do they pay something less?

6 MS. FANELLI: I don't think we normally
7 pay anything else. I think we charge the same base rate
8 on what things cost to deliver.

9 We don't have different rates for tenants
10 versus Trust buildings. So the Trust pays for its own
11 buildings.

12 MR. BUDROE: Okay.

13 MR. BERMAN: I mean, it's sort of like --
14 you may say well, I've got this big kiln in my garage and
15 I'm only going to have it on for fifteen minutes. So my
16 kilowatt hours are really small, but PG&E says that kiln
17 is a hundred kilowatt kiln, but we have to have a
18 system --

19 MR. BUDROE: But you're spreading that
20 over the entire Presidio.

21 MR. BERMAN: But you could say it's spread
22 over the entire City of San Francisco, but PG&E doesn't
23 feel that way. They say well, yes. You have something
24 that's -- we have to have a system in place for your
25 fifteen minutes of operating your thousand kilowatt kiln,

1 we need to have a big -- a big --

2 MS. NEWTON: Whether you're using it or
3 not.

4 MR. BERMAN: Right. And therefore you pay
5 a demand charge, which is based on your kilowatts, not --
6 not on the number of units.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I think we're going to
8 be able to have that answer maybe even --

9 MS. FANELLI: If I can get it, I'll e-mail
10 a response when I send you the information on the
11 presentation by TSR.

12 MR. BERMAN: Because we're all concerned
13 about where the money goes and we know that PG&E gets
14 theirs no matter what.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm just curious.

16 Coastal sites investigation. So this we're
17 talking about Baker Beach 2 and 1A, Merchant Road, all
18 those kinds of -- and I think the last time we checked on
19 this, Brian, you had given a couple -- you had given a
20 presentation.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: We had had some
23 questions.

24 Do we -- is that -- are your -- I know that
25 the organizations, the agencies were in discussion with

1 DTSC. There was a plan and various -- there was the PG&E
2 study.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: All those issues that
5 we talked about a few meetings back. So we're just
6 seeing where that discussion is.

7 MS. FANELLI: Well, I think I reported on
8 the schedule last month, but the RI report for Baker
9 Beach 1 was issued, and I think you all have access to
10 that 1A.

11 We're working on the FS report now and
12 hoping to get that to Park Service to review in a couple
13 of weeks.

14 The FS does provide a risk assessment, and
15 that risk assessment looks at the -- primarily it's
16 recreational, and the Trust has submitted a letter to
17 DTSC, and I'm not sure if you all were copied on it, but
18 I can get you a copy. That should be posted.

19 And in that letter, we requested a
20 modification to table 7-2 that would reflect calculating
21 risks from PAHs using EPA guidance slope factors that
22 were published in 1992.

23 There were -- if you remember the
24 discussion -- Brian, you can chime in at any point. The
25 cleanup level document used an OEHA State factor for

1 2002.

2 OEHA has updated that factor from 2010,
3 which indicates that PAHs are less risky than previously
4 thought.

5 The -- the issue we have is the timing of
6 assessment. The state is in the process of adopting the
7 standard, but we're a federal agency, and EPA has not yet
8 adopted it.

9 So the 1992 guide EPA uses is still more
10 conservative than the 2010 OEHA a number, and so we have
11 since -- we've recalculated risks for PAHs using EPA
12 number and we've submitted a letter to EPA for approval.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I should probably point
14 out that we have not concurred. Given an opportunity to
15 review, we did not concur that that change was
16 appropriate to make at this time.

17 MS. FANELLI: And that's true, and DTSC
18 has been provided a copy of the Park Service's letter and
19 their comments.

20 So our risk assessment will look at that
21 value as we move forward on Baker Beach 1A, but we are
22 hoping to get that out to Brian for review in the next
23 couple of weeks.

24 And then we did finish our sampling at
25 Baker Beach 2, and quite honestly, I haven't seen all of

1 that data, but we looked at the Mel's recycling area and
2 then the debris area.

3 The debris area is slow in coming in, so I
4 haven't actually seen that data to tabulate it yet.

5 But I know it's being worked on, and our
6 goal is to get that drafted into a RI report, draft the
7 RI report and get it to the Park Service for review.

8 And I don't have a copy of my quarterly
9 report, but the schedules for getting it to DTSC assumed
10 that there's an interim step where we're sharing that
11 information and working with the Park Service.

12 And then on Merchant Road, we have not
13 taken any action at this point. We're still working with
14 the Army on that.

15 MR. BERMAN: Question. Brian, could you
16 remind me? I know you said this when you gave your talk,
17 the reason why you're not concurring with the Trust on --
18 on this PAH standard.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is on the slope
20 factor that they've requested to be changed from the
21 State slope factor to the EPA slope factor, and the
22 change of that one factor is not terribly significant.

23 It's about a factor of two, but it does
24 begin to raise other issues. You know, is RPHs done best
25 with that type of slope factor? EPA is currently

1 reworking and looking how to do this.

2 So it seems to us that it's a distraction
3 in the process. We have an agreement that was made with
4 a group of chemicals and cleanup numbers that were set
5 for that group, the cleanup level document nearly ten
6 years ago that we've been working with, and so now start
7 and let's change this one set of compounds, that we
8 should then -- if we're going to do that, it begs the
9 question about what about the other compounds where other
10 factors have changed.

11 It really could take as long as it did the
12 first time, over a year to work on cleanup numbers.

13 We really should finish up this program.
14 That's our position. We are really better moving with
15 what we agreed to than starting the process and
16 distracting ourselves and re looking at cleanup levels.

17 MR. BUDROE: Especially because there's
18 some numbers that also change in the interim. For
19 example, chromium has changed, lead has changed, and you
20 would have to have a substantial reworking of the cleanup
21 level document if numbers were going to be start being
22 reopened.

23 The question would be is this going to be
24 done consistently or is that going to be done simply on
25 the basis of, you know, it's convenient to change this

1 one number.

2 It's not convenient, for example, to change
3 the lead cleanup standard. Even though it might be
4 entirely justified and probably would be justified at
5 this point.

6 So this is kind of a bit of a policy call
7 between all the involved agencies, I think, that needs to
8 be talked about at some point in time. Probably sooner
9 than later.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: There's -- the letter
11 is available on the SharePoint site that you mentioned to
12 DTSC. Maybe we can search it.

13 MS. FANELLI: I don't know that it's
14 posted on the SharePoint site, but it was sent to DTSC.

15 I wouldn't be surprised if it's not posted
16 on Envirostore.

17 MS. CHEEVER: So for now, given that there
18 is a disagreement, how does it get resolved? Does DTSC
19 get to decide?

20 MS. FANELLI: We presented a technical
21 case to DTSC and we're waiting to hear DTSC's comments.

22 MR. BOGGS: So it went to the risk
23 assessors. We have one person that specializes in
24 ecological and one that specializes in human health.

25 Kimi Klein does the human health. Jim

1 Polisini. I'm going to take their advice as far as what
2 they say. I'll be talking with them as far as inputs, et
3 cetera.

4 I don't know if they've gotten the Park
5 Service yet or not.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I did not, but I asked
7 Eileen if she should send it on.

8 MS. FANELLI: I did send it on. I
9 included the documentation.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Did you include Bob?

11 MS. FANELLI: I send it to Denise, to Kimi
12 and to Jim.

13 MS. CHAVEZ: What was in the DTSC guides?

14 MR. BOGGS: Good question. Basically
15 we'll take any proposal that any PRP presents to us and
16 look at it.

17 If it makes sense, they'll probably agree
18 with it. If they think there's other things that should
19 be considered, evaluated or weren't considered or weren't
20 evaluated, they'll make comments, but they'll just
21 basically provide technical comments on the document, but
22 Jim and Kimmie won't really make the decision.

23 Probably Denise will then take their advice
24 and decide whether to change the cleanup level or not for
25 PAHs, whether these other compounds get looked at and re-

1 evaluated or not.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: During our last monthly
4 meeting with the Park Service and the Trust with DTSC, I
5 offered to go into some of our underlying concerns as we
6 do -- if the State does want to entertain changing the
7 number, there are factors that we think should be
8 considered, which is why we don't want to go down that
9 slope, and there are PAHs that are not in the current
10 suite of analytes that are suspected lung carcinogens.

11 There's suggestions that mixtures of PAHs
12 may be more carcinogenic than some individual compounds.

13 It really does go into some PAHs and it
14 what it really does take to explore that or better answer
15 or better slope answer that we have now, but that's the
16 objective.

17 MR. BUDROE: Is there going to be -- this
18 proposed change, is there going to be an opportunity and
19 process for public comment?

20 MR. BOGGS: There -- before remedy can be
21 implemented? So probably not on the specific cleanup
22 level, if that gets changed, but that change gets
23 memorialized in the RAP, which does go out for a public
24 hearing, public comment.

25 So all the RAPs previously just referenced

1 the cleanup levels document. This one they probably
2 reference cleanup level document amended by for instance
3 a point in time.

4 So it's really -- the RAP is the decision
5 document and the RAP does go through public review.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Jan.

7 MS. BLUM: What is -- what is the monetary
8 difference between the way the Park Service would like it
9 done and the way the Trust wants it done?

10 MS. FANELLI: We haven't calculated any.

11 MS. BLUM: Would that be the defining
12 feature to go ahead and get it done?

13 MS. FANELLI: No. What we're trying to do
14 is establishing a reasonableness of a number that's
15 protective of human health and environment that is
16 defensible from a third party review standpoint.

17 MS. BLUM: Just for this one place.

18 MS. FANELLI: No. This letter was not
19 sent with regards to Baker Beach 1A. It was sent
20 generically.

21 MR. BOGGS: It will change the cleanup
22 level basewide. Kind of like they did with selenium at
23 fillsite 1 and 2. It didn't change the difference of
24 fifty cents or one scoop of dirt.

25 There was nothing left there that was in

1 between the old cleanup level and the new cleanup level.

2 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

3 MR. BOGGS: So for the cleanup cost, there
4 was no difference in the volume of soil. I don't know if
5 there'd be any difference here. Probably not a
6 significant difference. It's pretty much -- either it's
7 contaminated or it's not.

8 So unless that number really changes a lot,
9 it's probably not going to significantly change.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're not suggesting that
11 it's a really significant change, either, but it does
12 begin the process of other changes, and the Trust has
13 already indicated that they're going to be looking at
14 certain background chemicals associated with these sites
15 and possibly other sites.

16 So that it begins that process, as well.
17 So there's this whole work effort that goes into
18 reassessing cleanup levels.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: I wonder if the
20 department would be open to a letter from the RAB saying
21 we're aware of this situation and we understand you're
22 reviewing this PAH cleanup level. Could you come and
23 talk to us about what you're considering, something like
24 that?

25 MR. BOGGS: Yeah, no. We're a public

1 agency, and so the -- these RAB meetings, et cetera, if
2 you have a concern about that, yes, write to Denise and
3 express your concerns and your requests, and if it's a
4 reasonable request, they'll most likely honor it.

5 They sometimes get some requests that are
6 not directly related to the work, but we do -- but the
7 cleanup level is a perfectly reasonable --

8 FACILITATOR KERN: It seems like if we get
9 a letter that's been submitted and we'll understand
10 what's being requested and then we can go from there.

11 MR. BERMAN: Isn't the issue somewhat
12 clouded, because what Brian is bringing up is that this
13 is a precursor to a number of other events, and I don't
14 see how you could get DTSC to -- to discuss that. It
15 will just be on this one particular analyte.

16 And so -- and in a sense, it doesn't --
17 unless there's a larger issue -- as I understand what
18 Brian is saying -- and please correct me -- that if the
19 larger issue weren't on the horizon, they probably
20 wouldn't object.

21 That's the feeling I'm getting from his
22 statement. They're worried about opening the wound and
23 discovering a tumor.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the larger issue was
25 actually brought up first. So that's why we suspect that

1 there is a larger issue.

2 MR. BERMAN: Right. So I think from the
3 point of view of the RAB, I think I'm expressing my own
4 concern, it would not be a discussion surrounding this
5 one particular analyte, but really on the general issue
6 of whether the -- whether the limits that have been set
7 are meaningful and is this whole thing going to be
8 reopened with the -- sort of the camel's foot under the
9 tent with this first issue.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Well --

11 MR. BERMAN: Because that -- I mean, it's
12 not this one particular PAH that's the cause. It's the
13 idea that you open the door to another valuation of all
14 the cleanup levels.

15 That to me is more of a RAB issue than just
16 this one particular point here, because that seems to me
17 to be something that we as members of the public would
18 have a greater concern that the whole -- the whole stream
19 of cleanup levels could be under consideration.

20 So that's really -- in my mind, that's the
21 issue that we should discuss rather than narrow -- the
22 narrow issue of a particular point.

23 MR. BUDROE: I would say they're both
24 important because the larger issue, but PAHs are one of
25 the more important chemicals that concern the RAB and the

1 Presidio.

2 So it's not necessarily a small issue.

3 It's one of the major things that you worry about, you
4 know, when you're cleaning the site up.

5 So it deserves attention on its own, and
6 then the broader issue of okay. If you're going to open
7 up the cleanup level document, are you going to open it
8 up for everything or just for -- cherry pick a couple of
9 contaminants.

10 MR. BERMAN: Right.

11 MR. BUDROE: Because there are a lot of
12 changes that could be named -- some levels like PAHs,
13 maybe they would come down, but some would go up.

14 MR. BERMAN: But I don't think -- I mean,
15 DTSC already has consultants looking at the issue of this
16 particular PAH, and it seems to be a rather technical
17 issue, and I think it's more sensible for the RAB to look
18 at the more general policy here of what this means.

19 That's really -- I mean, as Brian says, if
20 it was just this one particular PAH, there wouldn't be
21 any -- the Park Service would probably say okay. It's
22 not much difference and probably from -- from what Bob
23 said, it wouldn't affect the cost, anyway, so -- it's
24 really -- to me, it's the larger issue of opening the
25 door to reconsideration of a lot of cleanup levels, and

Page 41

1 what is being thought about that?

2 Is that something that is going to be
3 downstream coming, and I guess maybe this is the first
4 one, but our concern is really it seems to me what Brian
5 has brought up is that this is just the beginning of a
6 potentially much larger process, and the question that
7 was -- can we get DTSC to come and say something
8 constructive about that.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I think that's
10 what we -- we've now been told that there's been a
11 letter. We need to communicate with them and see if we
12 can find things out, talk to them about what they're
13 considering. So let's see if we can do that.

14 MR. BERMAN: So you will as usual take on
15 the task of drafting a letter?

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

17 MS. FANELLI: Well, I'll copy you on the
18 letter that we sent because you'll probably want to read
19 that before you draft your letter, so you'll know what to
20 ask for.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: That makes sense.

22 Okay. Thank you for that.

23 So now we're moving on to some -- this is
24 on the agenda in the category of new business. So we're
25 looking at Mountain Lake planning, and some of this is

1 planning around the cleanup and planning around the
2 restoration. Because people are concerned about the
3 coordination of that.

4 So we kind of want to check in on that, and
5 then a document I noticed on the SharePoint site referred
6 to this Barnard Range rain garden, which I don't know too
7 much about, so I thought I would check in on that.

8 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: So on Mountain Lake
10 planning, there was a meeting. It was a public meeting
11 put on by DTSC, and the Trust was there. It was at the
12 Golden Gate Club, and this was --

13 MS. CHEEVER: September 26th.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: September 26th, a
15 Monday night, and there was maybe twenty community
16 members there, a fair showing of folks from different
17 organizations.

18 There was a lot of back and forth. There
19 was a fair amount of discussion of the CERCLA process and
20 then the various general ideas around the cleanup like
21 we'll dig it all out without draining the lake; we'll
22 drain the lake and dig that out; we'll cap the whole
23 thing and then there was another alternative, partially
24 capping all areas, which might go along with any
25 alternative or some alternative.

1 There were questions around the overflow
2 pipes, the drainage up along the road, how all those
3 things were going to work out.

4 So that was the thumbnail sketch of the
5 meeting, I would say, and there was also a risk
6 assessment mentioned, and all that has been sent out to
7 everybody. I think everybody got a copy of the Mountain
8 Lake investigate, summary and risk assessment.

9 And so we're kind of reading all that and
10 getting ready to have a meeting hopefully with DTSC on
11 that subject.

12 And I thought I would give you an
13 opportunity to tell us anything new since that meeting,
14 since I think it was only Jan and I were at that.

15 MS. FANELLI: Well, there's not too much
16 new other than the comments that I drafted down from that
17 meeting good comments from the public.

18 There was a comment on golfcourse practices
19 for water quality. There was a comment on the kind of
20 water quality monitoring that we do, and Terri was there
21 and was able to add a little bit of insight into some of
22 the basic monitoring that we do.

23 But there was a concern that water quality
24 monitoring for the contaminants in particular occurs.

25 There was some questions on the beach and

1 whether or not it had been sampled and what those data
2 have indicated.

3 There was a question about the boundary,
4 the property boundary between us and the City. Certainly
5 there was request for some clarification or additional
6 description of how the remediation and future enhancement
7 work is being coordinated, and then there was some
8 discussion on traffic that -- traffic impacts that might
9 occur during the implementation of the remedy.

10 My understanding is that DTSC is scheduling
11 a public meeting in November, so that announcement should
12 be out soon, and let's see. That was Genevieve calling.
13 I think it was about the key. I think.

14 And there's going to be an agency meeting
15 probably during the day, but the Trust right now is
16 working with DTSC. We've responded -- we're responding
17 to comments on that Remedial Investigation Report issuing
18 what we hope is the Final RI, and then I think the
19 concept that DTSC has for the next public meeting is a
20 workshop on some of those restoration alternatives,
21 whether dry dredging or wet dredging, how that happens,
22 to generate some comment, and the intent to use that
23 comment to inform the FS.

24 We're on a very tight time frame. So
25 ideally we're -- we're working on these alternatives to

1 present in a workshop, and then our hope is to turn the
2 FS around so that there is a public document early in
3 2012 about that.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: I have also received a
5 bunch of questions between that meeting and this one, and
6 one of them that keeps coming up is more restoration type
7 questions.

8 And since Terri and -- and you're here, I'm
9 wondering can we have a meeting -- not necessarily a RAB
10 meeting, but can we have a meeting that would speak to
11 the designs that are thought for what -- the vision for
12 Mountain Lake and who's coordinating that and just so we
13 don't take those to you, but if we had a -- if the
14 community had a really good idea from -- from your
15 department what the vision is, then we could interface
16 better I think with the remediation folks.

17 You know, if the plan was on the -- say the
18 south shore, the bank -- well, we're going to have this
19 redone playground and then we're going to do the eastern
20 arm in this way, just so we knew what that was and then
21 when we came to these other meetings, we would have a
22 much better idea.

23 I'm just wondering if we can --

24 MS. THOMAS: The person to ask is Michael
25 Bolin. He's the chief of planning and I know he's coming

1 to people for the Presidio on Friday and addressing this
2 issue.

3 So it might be a reasonable time to talk to
4 him about what kind of outreach --

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

6 MS. THOMAS: -- the communities want on
7 that topic.

8 It just seems like a pretty good forum for
9 it.

10 MS. NEWTON: Were most of the people at
11 the meeting Friends of Mountain Lake people?

12 FACILITATOR KERN: There were some Friends
13 of Mountain Lake people, but then there were a variety of
14 groups, Lake Street, neighbors and other folks.

15 MS. BLUM: Whether -- I didn't get a
16 notice that that meeting was going to be held. I heard
17 about it the day of the meeting, and I had been out of
18 town on vacation and I heard that you announced it at the
19 RAB meeting.

20 But it seems to me that the RAB members
21 should be included on every communication about a public
22 meeting that has to do with the Presidio so we can attend
23 if we want to.

24 I was just -- I didn't -- I was just
25 surprised that no communication was --

1 MS. FANELLI: The communications were sent
2 by DTSC.

3 MS. BLUM: I don't know how to make that
4 comment to them. But they did a bad job of outreach, in
5 my opinion, because they completely overlooked, including
6 the RAB, the first time we ever have an informational
7 meeting on that subject, and I was very offended about
8 it. It was the wrong move.

9 This advisory body is trying to do its job
10 and needs to be included on every public meeting about a
11 site in the Presidio.

12 So I don't know. Should I write a letter?
13 How do I --

14 MR. BOGGS: Or e-mail the public
15 participation specialist that we have. I think you've
16 met her a couple times.

17 MS. BLUM: Yes.

18 MR. BOGGS: Since she's now involved,
19 you're right. You should be -- this group in particular
20 should be notified.

21 The outreach is supposed to go beyond this
22 group.

23 MS. BLUM: Right.

24 MR. BOGGS: So let her know your concerns.

25 MS. BLUM: Okay.

1 MS. CHEEVER: So what is the answer to how
2 the addressing of the sediment through the remediation is
3 fitting in with the overlapping area that would be
4 addressed through the restoration?

5 MS. FANELLI: Well, the Trust has
6 coordinated -- as a matter of fact, Terri and I have a
7 meeting later this week to discuss further what
8 remediation feels the area is to be cleaned up and how
9 that affects or doesn't -- how that furthers the -- the
10 goals for the enhancement, and I know, Terri, you have
11 your onset of specialists for at this.

12 MS. THOMAS: The enhancement plan EA is
13 still the goal of the Park Service and the Trust, a joint
14 effort, and the original time that we created this
15 restoration plan, we thought we would be dredging the
16 lake, and the gentleman who participated in the
17 engineering of that dredging is a consultant we have
18 brought back on to work for -- on the ecological
19 restoration part with Eileen's engineers, as well, so
20 that we are -- are confident that once the remediation is
21 done, we can do the restoration in the appropriate
22 ecological restoration way.

23 So I think we'll be working together to see
24 how it fits in, and then we'll probably be requesting,
25 you know, to do it all at once just so that the neighbors

1 don't get bugged twice or whatever.

2 But they're not exactly the same project.

3 So we have to make that delineation between where
4 remediation stops doing their job and where the
5 ecological restoration piece picks up, and also at that
6 meeting, it was mentioned that there is some separate
7 funding for the east arm.

8 So since that was mentioned in public, I
9 will mention it here, which was also part of the plan,
10 and so -- that's about on the same schedule.

11 So it's pretty important that that whole
12 area be coordinated, and we're going to certainly make
13 that effort starting this week. There's actually several
14 meetings this week that's a combination of departments
15 trying to work together.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Are you sort of saying,
17 though, that maybe dredging or some alternative to the
18 sediment might not be needed for the restoration?

19 MS. THOMAS: Oh, it's always been needed,
20 but when we went to start it in the beginning, that was
21 when they found the lead.

22 We were going to dredge it for the
23 restoration reason, but the lead was found and we were
24 stopped in our tracks, and now the remediation can be
25 taken care of, which helps a lot.

1 MS. CHEEVER: I just remember that a few
2 years ago -- I don't have the papers in front of me --
3 there were two overlapping areas, one for the restoration
4 and one for removal of sediment.

5 MS. THOMAS: They're overlapping, but the
6 remediation is completely within the enhancement area
7 now, I think.

8 Isn't it? When you look at the enhancement
9 map, between the remediation project within it?

10 MS. FANELLI: Most of our work is going to
11 be essentially below the water line.

12 MS. CHEEVER: I'm just talking about the
13 part below the water line.

14 MS. THOMAS: I think that they're not
15 overlapping anymore. I think the remediation project is.
16 But the way that they might be overlapping is there could
17 be a difference within like the slope that one wants to
18 have versus the other or something like that.

19 So there might be some overlapping parts
20 where we have to discuss how to make that work.

21 Oh, and the other specialist we have on,
22 many of you may know, Peter Bay. He has been with a lot
23 of regulatory agencies in the past, he was with the Army
24 Corps, Fish and Wildlife Service, and he is writing the
25 submerged aquatic plant part of the restoration, because

1 the dredging, no matter how much we do, because the lake
2 is reduced in size so much, won't be able to keep it
3 healthy.

4 So we're trying to also look at how we can
5 plant it and how we can do some things ecologically so we
6 don't have to aerate in the future. We're still looking
7 at a lot of alternatives.

8 We have two specialists, Al Storn and Peter
9 Bay that are going to be working.

10 MS. FANELLI: I think Michael has
11 indicated that he does want to hold a meeting that will
12 focus on the enhancement and the different elements of
13 the enhancement, and --

14 MS. THOMAS: And we have a meeting to talk
15 about that kind of stuff this week, too.

16 MS. FANELLI: Tomorrow.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: That's great. I --

18 MS. THOMAS: We'll bring it up to him,
19 also.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Please.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Go ahead.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: All I was going to say
23 was it's been my experience that as the agency plans come
24 out and we start hearing them and we get to throw in our
25 two cents, there's an occasional good idea that comes

1 out.

2 So I just really want to have that
3 opportunity, because people have been thinking about this
4 a long time, and if the plans come out, somebody can just
5 say well, weren't you planning on doing X, Y or Z, and we
6 can have that talk.

7 MS. THOMAS: You know, both Michael and I
8 go back to the beginnings of this project and we know
9 that the community's very engaged in the project.

10 So I have a feeling there'll be more than
11 one. We'll find out more by the end of the week.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: I have two questions.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: One, DTSC's only involved
16 with remediation, not restoration; right?

17 MR. BOGGS: 99 percent.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

19 MR. BOGGS: There's a little overlap
20 having to do with ARARs, but really our focus is the
21 cleanup.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

23 MR. BOGGS: But there are regulations that
24 may or may not tie in.

25 For example, the Historic Preservation Act.

1 It's not really our regulation, but it may play into the
2 plans that we approve because you have to protect
3 something because it's historical, or you have to restore
4 a parking lot for some other reason or you have to
5 restore a slope to be ADA compliant.

6 Those kind of restoration things are kind
7 of off to the side while we're still focusing on.

8 So the plans to be approved, we generally
9 want to make sure they comply with other regulations, but
10 we don't -- that's not our focus.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: So then the remediation's
12 only below the water line? So it's only Mountain Lake.
13 It's not Mountain Lake Park?

14 MS. FANELLI: No. It's not Mountain Lake
15 Park.

16 MS. THOMAS: Except that little triangle
17 that belongs to the City.

18 MS. FANELLI: If it's in below the water
19 line, sediments that belong to the City that's
20 contaminated, we're going to include that, but the park
21 itself is City property and they were actually at the
22 meeting on the 26th, as well.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, okay.

24 MS. FANELLI: And we would not be cleaning
25 up the City of San Francisco property.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: That includes the
2 shoreline?

3 MS. FANELLI: That includes the -- I'm not
4 sure I understand what nuance you're getting at.

5 MR. BOGGS: It doesn't require -- at this
6 point, they don't have contaminants of cleanup levels on
7 the shoreline.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

9 MR. BOGGS: So it's not required.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: That answers the question.

11 MR. BOGGS: Yeah. The contaminants are
12 pretty much limited to sediments in the water.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

14 MS. BLUM: That issue did come up at the
15 public meeting that Mountain Lake people were very
16 concerned about the lack of testing in the RPD section
17 and that they want to know whether that beach is clean or
18 not. They were pretty adamant about that point.

19 MS. FANELLI: That's one of the questions
20 that I took back that I read off earlier that there was a
21 comment, and so Genevieve is working with RPM with the
22 representatives of the City --

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

24 MS. FANELLI: -- where we have overlap in
25 jurisdiction.

1 There's really a lot of coordination
2 occurring; not necessarily internally, but the City's
3 also involved in the site, and we still are discussing
4 the Caltrans.

5 Although it's not a public document yet,
6 but -- I can't really discuss it, but we are continuing
7 to talk with them, and a lot is happening in a very short
8 time because we are trying to -- given when -- we're
9 trying to complete this work, we're trying to get
10 construction this summer on the main sediment cleanup.

11 I get a lot of groundwork covered in the
12 next three months. So there will be some hefty
13 documents, and I think these public meetings where we
14 talk about alternatives would be a really good
15 opportunity to come in and comment, because the point is
16 to have that discussion with the broader community before
17 we issue a document to try to capture as much of the
18 concerns as we can.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: I wanted to check in.
20 Did anybody have a chance to skim or even flip through
21 that Mountain Lake document?

22 My -- my quick review of it, I noticed in
23 the risk assessment part of that, there seems to be some
24 alternative ways of looking at the data.

25 MS. FANELLI: I believe --

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Is that a better way of
2 saying it?

3 MS. FANELLI: The risk assessment was
4 designed to look at risk reduction based on how much
5 sediment was actually removed.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

7 MS. FANELLI: And so it kind of looks at
8 the do I do this on a point by point basis, do I do this
9 on an average basis.

10 What do I see if I look at removal of
11 certain -- Genevieve uses the word cuts, but if you take
12 out the upper two feet which has the bulk of
13 contaminants, what are the risk reductions?

14 If I go after every single point that's
15 involved with 82 that we have in there as the ecological
16 cleanup level, what does that leave us with risk?

17 It's not proposing at this point any
18 particular cut. It's looking at the range of incremental
19 improvement you get as you take that analysis.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. I just bring
21 that up because it seemed a little bit different format
22 that I've seen by laying out those different scenarios,
23 and that would be something that I'd really like to check
24 in further about, the methodology and the different data
25 sets and all of that and how that might actually be used

1 in the decision-making process.

2 Do we have time tonight? That's a little
3 bit more of a technical and incredibly mind-numbing
4 boring discussion, except for all of those in the room
5 that are really into that stuff.

6 So in the last couple of minutes, we have
7 this rain garden. Maybe you could tell us what that is.

8 MS. FANELLI: What the rain garden is --
9 because I believe you were copied on all the
10 correspondence on it.

11 So building 42, which is the building right
12 over here is being rehabilitated -- what would you call
13 it? A bed and breakfast. It's a commercial lodge, and
14 part of their work is improving their parking lot.

15 And best management practices with runoff
16 from parking structures is to use things like BMPs or
17 bioswales, the same thing we conducted at landfill 10,
18 the same thing when we finished the toe of landfill E, to
19 treat runoff.

20 So this is not a remediation project, but
21 it is in essence a BMP. I have no idea where it got the
22 name rain garden.

23 MS. THOMAS: I don't think there's any
24 plans being proposed to plant anything.

25 MS. FANELLI: So I think drainage that now

1 goes into the same area where the landfill E runoff goes
2 into. The drainage from that area is in the pipe that
3 discharges to that -- I don't want to call it the firing
4 range.

5 MS. THOMAS: West trib.

6 MS. FANELLI: West trib, but this project
7 is going to build a bioswale, a little retention basin,
8 if you will, on the upper slopes of the west trib to
9 treat the runoff that's going into the west trib before
10 it discharges directly into the west trib, and before,
11 which is it's not in the footprint of the Barnard Avenue
12 protection range, and we haven't submitted any of that
13 data yet to DTSC to construct that.

14 DTSC requests that we do a soil management
15 plan, and what that is is -- is basically saying okay.
16 The soil that we take out to construct, it will handle it
17 properly, and we'll sample beneath it just to make sure
18 we understand what we're leaving in place, so that we can
19 address that if we have to in the future and incorporate
20 that into future remediation plans.

21 We don't anticipate issues up there where
22 it's being constructed, but that's what that soil
23 management plan is. It basically says we'll sample and
24 collect data while that's being constructed, and we'll
25 handle it if we find anything.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I think since I really
2 have never heard of a rain garden -- I really appreciate
3 you describing the project. I wouldn't want to describe
4 it because I don't really know what the -- didn't really
5 know what it was for.

6 If I had a -- something that I would want
7 to communicate about the western tributary, at least in a
8 perfect world, that would be equally restored beautiful
9 habitat and that there -- there can be a tendency for
10 creek or low lying areas to be places where, you know,
11 parking lot runoff is diverted.

12 It just becomes kind of a -- of a drainage
13 rather than a restored habitat.

14 So rain garden sounded pretty neat, kind
15 of, in a way, but it also was nothing that I'd ever heard
16 of, and I just would like to know that if we're going
17 to -- what, if we treat water that's going into a
18 restored area because it all comes down and all goes out
19 to the bay.

20 I'm just sensitive to anything that gets
21 drained into these tributaries.

22 MS. THOMAS: That's exactly what -- that's
23 exactly the reason for it when we -- when we started
24 thinking about Tennessee Hollow, we really kind of
25 thought the water was going to be clean going into

1 Tennessee Hollow, and then when you start to realize it's
2 not really or there's this runoff from this parking lot,
3 you think well, really shouldn't it be clean when it gets
4 there?

5 So when they proposed this, which is --
6 which is a lead, now a high sustainability product is
7 when you're redoing a building to actually have it
8 environmentally sustainable and these BMP's for runoff is
9 a way to do that.

10 So it actually ups your environmental
11 rating if you have these. And so it was kind of like
12 well, it is in a native plant community zone, but it's
13 also protecting the creek and it's allowing -- we want to
14 get water in the creek as high up the drainage as it
15 naturally would be.

16 So we thought it was probably worth --
17 worth it, and it was -- the whole area is -- has so many
18 projects going on in it, that it's really going to be
19 hard to figure out what it's going to be like until we
20 can kind of get to this next step.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

22 MS. THOMAS: It hasn't been designed or
23 what has been designed is very minimal and we can play
24 with it.

25 And also the groundwater's pretty low

1 there, so --

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: It is.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: It's a pond.

5 MR. BOGGS: A lot of drainage from
6 projects. You have some sort of biofilter type deal
7 rather than a straight pipe into the creek like you're
8 talking about.

9 This kind of helps it dissipate and it's
10 kind of a -- a green thing to do.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Something new for me,
12 rain gardens.

13 MS. FANELLI: It is not actually being
14 constructed by remediation. We'll collect the samples.
15 It's being constructed by the building 42 project.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. I want to be
17 respectful of the time. It's 9:02. I want to just
18 quickly review the action items, then.

19 So we have the -- the kilowatt hours charge
20 for building 228, checking in on that. I noticed that
21 the Baker Beach 1A remedial investigation's out. We can
22 review that.

23 Checking in on the letter to DTSC about the
24 modification of PAH slope factors. I need to check into
25 that.

1 The Baker Beach metals recycling debris
2 area. That's going to be coming out into an RI. I don't
3 have to do anything about that yet.

4 We're going to try to get in touch with
5 Michael Boland about Mountain Lake enhancement plan, see
6 what he has to say about that.

7 Let's see. Any other items that --

8 MS. FANELLI: I'm going to send you the
9 information on TSR's presentation for their system.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Right. Very good.
11 Let's see. Those were the action items. Thank you very
12 much for all those updates.

13 MS. FANELLI: So next month, if TSR's
14 available, you want a presentation on that?

15 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: That would be great.

17 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: I want to thank
19 everybody for coming out tonight, for your patience in
20 the building relocation, getting in. I know you had to
21 shout from the street.

22 MS. FANELLI: I do apologize for the keys
23 and not having the building open. But this actually in
24 some way I think is more comfortable and you can hear
25 better, the light's a little bit better, although it's a

1 lot more difficult.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: They won't let us meet here
3 every month, will they?

4 MS. FANELLI: I don't know, Terri. Do you
5 think we're going to hear anything about letting these
6 guys in?

7 MS. BLUM: It is a lot easier to hear.

8 MS. FANELLI: It is. I can find out if
9 it's possible. It's just going to be difficult to get
10 in.

11 We have to have some type of arrangement so
12 that people can notify from the outside if they allow.
13 But I certainly think it's a nicer space for us.

14 MR. BUDROE: Technically you got the
15 possibility of some general public.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Technically it's a
17 public meeting.

18 MR. BUDROE: True.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else for the
20 good of the order? Without objection, meeting adjourned.

21 (The meeting concluded at 9:05 PM).

22 ---o0o---

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the time
5 and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a full, true and
6 complete record of said matter.

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for
8 either or any of the parties in the foregoing meeting and caption
9 named, or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in
10 said action.

11

12

13

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have

14

hereunto set my hand this

15

28th day of October,

16

2011.

17

18

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2011

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

ATTENDEES

RAB Members:

Doug Kern, Facilitator
 Mark Youngkin
 Eileen Fanelli
 Terri Thomas
 Ryan Seelbach
 Terri Thomas
 Brian Ullensvang
 Denise Tsuji
 Medi Sunga
 Toni Kramer
 John Budroe
 Jan Blum
 Jan Monaghan
 Edward Callanan
 Julie Cheever

Special Guests:

Mike Beck
 Dave Fleming
 John Lillie
 Tom Powell

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
 of the Meeting, and on November 8, 2011, 7:05 PM at the
 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

---o0o---

AGENDA

	Page
1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	5
3) Announcements and Old Business - None	
4) Reports and Discussions:	
A. Building 228 Update - Ryan Seelbach	5
B. Presentation by Mr. Fleming -	7
5) Regulatory Agency Status Updates	
Denise Tsuji, DTSC	61
Medi Sunga, DTSC	62
6) New Business -	66
7) Public Comment	83
8) Review of Action Items:	88
9) Closing:	90

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone to
2 the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio
3 Restoration Advisory Board. This is November 2011,
4 November 8th, actually, as I'm sure you're all aware.
5 There was a close encounter with a large asteroid today
6 flying by.

7 MR. BECK: That was today?

8 FACILLITATOR KERN: That was today, yes.
9 It actually passed between the -- the orbit of the moon
10 and the Earth in between us.

11 MR. FLEMING: Did you see it?

12 FACILITATOR KERN: No. Apparently you
13 need a pretty good sized telescope, actually.

14 So that was of great interest, and of
15 course this Friday we have 11-11-11, so around midday
16 when it's 11:00 AM, eleven minutes after, eleven seconds,
17 there are going to be all kinds of ones in alignment
18 there.

19 So just a few things of note. I thought
20 I'd bring that to everybody's attention.

21 Welcome, everyone. We have some new faces
22 tonight. I'm sure we'll introduce them as we get to the
23 particular subjects, but we want to welcome you in
24 advance.

25 Does everyone have an agenda for tonight?

1 Are there any changes or suggestions?

2 Very good. Any announcements?

3 Seeing none, we will move on with the
4 agenda about building 238, which is the process that we
5 have so much interest in around the heating of the
6 petroleum products in ground through large probes and
7 electricity usage. So we're quite interested in hearing
8 what's going to happen at that site fan.

9 MR. SEELBACH: So I'll speak to the
10 introductions. First, my name is Ryan Seelbach. I'm
11 project manager through the Presidio Trust. I only come
12 about once a day, so everyone should know me.

13 Mike Beck is with AMEC. He's the engineer,
14 project engineer for the entire project. He's out from
15 Minnesota today. I hope it's not too cold back there.

16 Then these three gentlemen with the TRS.
17 TRS is the firm that's installed the treatment system for
18 us and they're going to be giving a presentation as well
19 as Mike.

20 So on the left is John Lillie, you can tell
21 by his skin color that he's a construction manager.

22 Dave Fleming, VP, marketing of sales, and
23 Dave Powell -- he'll be speaking, and also at the end,
24 please feel free to ask questions. They can probably
25 answer just about every question.

1 Anybody have any questions just about the
2 status of the 207/231 site? Jan just kind of mentioned.
3 She was wondering where we are as far as schedule goes.

4 We completed -- I don't know if you
5 recall -- it has several different sources of
6 contamination. One was the building 207 area where the
7 former gas station was.

8 We completed that remediation. AMEC was
9 the consultant for that. We completed that. Now the
10 228, the former dry cleaner site, AMEC has brought on TRS
11 to do the in-situ treatment.

12 And this coming summer we're hoping to
13 do -- we are actually going to do the mass excavation of
14 the other gas station there, 231 as well as building 230,
15 and the reason we're pushing it to this date is because
16 of the Caltrans Doyle Drive construction project.

17 Their schedule is to remove the viaduct
18 March, April. I've heard actually November, January. I
19 think it's going to be March, but when that comes down,
20 they're going to be removing a lot of utilities and
21 really giving us a nice access to the whole area to do
22 our excavation, and then they'll jump right into our area
23 and build their -- their Doyle Drive -- their second
24 phase of construction.

25 So with that, I'll give it back to Mike.

1 MR. BECK: Okay. I think Dave, do you
2 want to --

3 MR. FLEMING: Should we start?

4 MR. BECK: Do you want to show the video
5 first?

6 MR. FLEMING: Launch the Power Point, if
7 you would.

8 When they're in town, there's a -- we've
9 got probably eleven, twelve folks in town. We've got a
10 work town we're doing tomorrow. There's a lot of folks
11 to hear about the technology, hear about the site that
12 we're doing here at the Presidio, and then we're going to
13 bring them out to the site to see the operation,
14 operating system right afternoon some, and we've also got
15 an executive team here and our board of directors here,
16 people from all over the country who have come to take
17 advantage of us being here to have these meetings this
18 week.

19 So there's -- yeah there's a large group of
20 us here.

21 What I thought we'd do is share with you
22 all how the technology works, spend about fifteen
23 minutes, go through the technology, show you how it
24 works, and please ask questions along the way, and then
25 Mike is going to talk more about the system itself and

1 some details about the projects.

2 So go to the next one, and I wanted to show
3 you a video. So if you put your cursor. Colorado State
4 University did a bench study, filled the tank full of
5 sand in the lab and interlaid these clay lenses that you
6 see here, these four lenses and then flooded the tank
7 with the dye to mimic solvent in a heterogenous solution
8 and then he flooded with a water flood, the blue water
9 coming through there to show the fusion of the solvent or
10 the dye into this clay, and then over time backed the
11 fusion of that solvent out of the clay creating a
12 downgradient plume in the flow of a groundwater
13 direction.

14 And the point of this study was to show the
15 technologies that are the flow, like trying to get air
16 pushed into a system or chemical oxygen system like silts
17 or bay mud like we have here.

18 You're not going to get them cleaned up,
19 because this contaminant will fuse into the clay. It
20 will back into the surrounding clay and into the
21 groundwater, and injective flow technologies are not
22 going to clean up the clay because they can't get inside
23 the clay. Too tight.

24 Too tight a matrix for that technology, but
25 our technology does not have that limitation, because

1 we'll have pass -- pass current electrical current
2 through the clay like we do gravel, any soil type and
3 we'll actually create a change inside that clay.

4 So we're creating a heat and we force a
5 phase change from water to steam or volatile contaminant
6 to vapor, and then under vacuum recover to the surface.

7 So that's why we're able to clean up these
8 type soils, and I'm going to explain more about how that
9 works as we go along.

10 We're doing in-situ soil in groundwater
11 remediation. So this is really the only technology out
12 there that can do both soil and groundwater at the same
13 time in-situ, so in the ground, right.

14 We actually preferentially heat those type
15 clay lenses which tend to be the area where contaminant
16 gets caught up into those lenses because they migrate
17 into those lenses because they're caught inside that
18 clay. They can't get out without our help.

19 We're doing VOCs, volatile organic
20 compounds. Most of our work is in volatile. Petroleum
21 hydrocarbons from a fuel oil all the way to the boiling
22 point of a -- like the dry cleaning solvent and many
23 different compounds in between those boiling point
24 ranges.

25 Solid grease, we've cleaned up solid grease

1 before. Now the way we're able to do that is heat it up
2 and basically melt it. We lower the viscosity of the
3 type of material and recover, but in the case of the
4 Presidio, this is a volatile and we're creating that
5 phase change, liquid to vapor and then a vacuum
6 recovering it and then using steam as a carrier gas to
7 create it.

8 So we're creating steam by forcing that
9 phase change, water to steam and then under a vacuum
10 recovering that, as well.

11 It's a rapid technology. As you see here,
12 we've only been applying energy for a few months starting
13 in August, and as you'll see, the results are very good
14 in our interim sampling.

15 As of the time, we clean up sites six to
16 nine months. Sometimes it's quicker than that, a couple
17 of months. Sometimes it's longer, but most of the time
18 on average, six to nine months, and we don't dessicate
19 the water.

20 We have to have water in the soil for this
21 to work. It's the water in the subsurface that conducts
22 the electricity, okay, and it's the soil particles that
23 resist the flow of current in the soil to create the
24 heat.

25 I'll show you more about that in a minute.

1 It's proven safe and effective. We've done
2 about eighty projects nationwide over the course of
3 eleven years and it's been very effective on every site
4 we've ever tried.

5 This last bullet, customers sell it, and
6 it's awesome, because this technology offers the greatest
7 reduction in contamination in soil and groundwater over
8 the shortest period of time for the least amount of money
9 when you compare it to the total excising cost of the
10 technology.

11 Go ahead.

12 So these are the different contaminants
13 that we've cleaned up around the country. As you can
14 see, most of the sites, over half of them have been
15 focused on chlorine solvents, and we've also done these
16 other ones, and we've worked with phenochlorizine by
17 combining it with sodium persulfate up in Seattle.

18 Before we did that, no one actually even
19 thought that we could do that, but it turned out it
20 worked very well.

21 Go ahead.

22 So this is kind of how the technology
23 works, okay. We come out to a site. Press the next one,
24 and we've got these heterogeneous clays, sinks, beta
25 zones, saturated zones, and it migrates down through the

1 vadoze zone, more permeable, and rests on top of the
2 bedrock interface.

3 Groundwater's flowing in this direction.
4 We're dependent upon companies like AMEC to tell us where
5 the contaminant is. They actually study the site and
6 identify where the contamination is.

7 Go ahead.

8 And then we'll design our system based on
9 their data, like we did here at the Presidio and advance
10 these electrodes we call them, these vertical electrodes.

11 They're inside bore holes, so this is a
12 common drilling technique that's used, a hollow stem
13 auger, you know, sonic drilling, whatever available
14 technology to advance a big hole.

15 It's a big diameter hole, twelve inches
16 diameter outside the hole. Most of the time, it's a
17 steel pipe, and you can think of the electrode as an
18 upside down monitoring well.

19 Whereas the monitoring well, you've got the
20 screen at the bottom of the well to collect water
21 samples.

22 In our electrode, we've got the screen on
23 top of the well to recover vapors under vacuum.
24 Typically these are on the order of twelve to twenty feet
25 apart.

1 And there's no depth limitation to this
2 technology that we're aware of, but the deepest we've
3 applied it is about 130 feet. As long as you drill down
4 to the contamination, we can install the electrodes.

5 We also used temperature monitoring points
6 to monitor -- to monitor subsurface temperature. You
7 don't see them on here, but they'll be interspersed
8 between the electrodes to electric subsurface
9 temperatures over time.

10 Once we've installed the electrodes and the
11 recovery wells and temperature monitoring points in the
12 ground, we'll bring out our equipment to the site and
13 step down the power from the power line, the municipal
14 utility line into our power control unit and then deliver
15 the energy using cables out to the electric food, and
16 then we'll also put in our conveyance pipe that we'll use
17 for the vapor steam recovery and make all these
18 connections at the surface and bring out our other
19 equipment, steam condenser, a blower and vapor treatment
20 treatment technology that we're using.

21 And then we'll energize the site. This is
22 high voltage power that comes off the power line and it's
23 alternating current. It's flowing between the
24 electrodes, heating up the subsurface to steam
25 temperatures.

1 So we're using both the water as a --
2 converting it to steam as a carrier gas to help remove
3 the volatile from the subsurface. We're heating up the
4 subsurface, forcing a phase change from liquid to vapor
5 or water to steam and then recovering under vacuum. Go
6 ahead, the next one.

7 We're recovering under vacuum. The steam
8 and the vapors to the surface where we treat them. In
9 this case here, we're using an oxidizer to treat the
10 vapors. Often, we'll use various carbons. Granular
11 activated carbon.

12 What happens is through AMEC, usually, will
13 be the company that would actually do the bails line
14 sampling at a site and then interim sampling. The
15 monitor will be helpful, and then we'll decide together
16 at the end of the project, if we think we're done and we
17 think the soil's cleaned up, by monitoring different
18 metrics, energy input, time, you know, vacuum, air flows,
19 things like that and we'll see we think it's time to do
20 the confirmatory sampling. We'll see if we're done or
21 not. Right?

22 Once we're done, we will remove everything
23 at the surface, cut it off just below the surface and
24 grout it and then seal it at the surface.

25 So that's in a nutshell how it works.

1 We'll get into more details. But did you all have any
2 questions about any of that, comments? Yes.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the things we
4 were concerned about initially before we understood it
5 better was -- was there a possibility of explosions?
6 Would there be -- you know, how much power would this
7 use.

8 I guess we'll learned that the power cost
9 was about \$50,000 or so?

10 MS. FANELLI: I think we're estimating
11 higher than that by the time we're all done.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: And then the explosive
13 have issue is kind of put aside. But I have been by the
14 site early on and there were some smells, some acrid sort
15 of weird smells come off the thing.

16 I'm wondering if you've had any other
17 experience with odors around the sites.

18 MR. FLEMING: Can I answer the first two
19 questions first?

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Of course.

21 MR. FLEMING: To have an explosion, you
22 have to complete a triangle: Fuel, oxygen and a
23 transmission source.

24 At the subsurface, we have very little
25 oxygen, not enough to start an explosion. There's no

1 ignition source. Very little fuel and not enough to
2 create an explosion. We don't see that and we've never
3 had that happen at any site.

4 The second one was about energy. So the
5 cost of energy typically at our sites is the good
6 fifteen -- represents fifteen to twenty percent of the
7 total cost of the site, typically. Sometimes it's higher
8 than that a little bit. California, New York, a little
9 bit higher, perhaps, but most of the time, that's the
10 range.

11 On the odor side thing, no. That's not a
12 common occurrence at our site, but. I don't know. Do
13 you want to --

14 MR. BECK: So before they started, we got
15 a permit with the Air -- Air Board, the Bay Area Air
16 Quality Management District and we're using a thermal
17 catalytic oxydizer to treat the Stoddard solvent, and the
18 oxidizeer treats about 89 to 97 percent of the Stoddard
19 Solvent.

20 Our discharge permit at the concentrations
21 we're bringing into our system requires it to treat it at
22 ninety percent, and Stoddard solvent has a fairly low
23 odor threshold, so you can smell it occasionally if the
24 meteorological conditions are right, it comes up, and, in
25 fact, today was one of those days, and, you know, if you

1 were onsite today.

2 There's a second odor that is more
3 prevalent right inside the treatment area and it's --
4 it's the smell of hot dirt, and it's -- and it smells
5 different than the Stoddard solvent, and sometimes I
6 suppose in the right wind condition, you can smell that
7 outside the fence, too, but that's generally what
8 we're -- what we've been experiencing out there.

9 But the sampling that we've done, we've
10 done two different sampling events and it confirmed that
11 the oxidizer's working as it should be, and so there is
12 some nuisance odor that props up from time to time, but
13 there's no safety concerns.

14 MS. BLUM: Did I understand you to say
15 that you leave the electrodes in place when you're
16 finished with the removal?

17 MR. FLEMING: Most of the time, they are
18 left in the ground. They can be removed. It just costs
19 more to do that.

20 MS. BLUM: What is their composition? Is
21 there any danger of them decomposing in the soil?

22 MR. FLEMING: Actually, no. There's no
23 contamination in them. They're steel, usually, and
24 there's actually an added benefit of leaving them in the
25 ground.

1 You've probably heard of iron filing walls,
2 perhaps, as a remediation technique or permeable
3 reaction.

4 What happens is when contamination comes
5 into contact with our electrode, there's actually some
6 degradation that occurs of the contaminant.

7 So it actually speeds up the degradation of
8 the contaminant, which is a big benefit of our
9 technologies.

10 MR. BECK: That's true for a fluoridated
11 solvent like this. The iron won't help at our site
12 because we're dealing with a petroleum constituent.

13 MS. BLUM: Thanks.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Is the equipment your
15 proprietary equipment that you take it back when you
16 leave?

17 MR. FLEMING: We own it.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: So we're leasing it.

19 MR. FLEMING: Leasing it for the project.

20 So I was going to get into a little bit
21 more detail about how we're going to get into the
22 contaminant hot spots and I'm going to zoom in on this
23 clear lens right here on the corner.

24 This has to do with a chlorine solvent
25 site, which as Mike pointed out, it's not what we're

1 doing here, but it still applies.

2 MR. BECK: We do have low permeable
3 lenses.

4 MR. FLEMING: This does apply in that
5 sense. So in a situation like you have here, a low
6 permeable lens with contamination that's gotten caught up
7 inside this lens.

8 Again, this would be a site that's
9 undergoing to the reductive chlorination, so it's a
10 chlorinated solvent example, not exactly similar to this,
11 but there would be some breakdowns occurring in the
12 contamination here, as well.

13 And this lens, we call it a high electrical
14 conductivity, so it's got more charged particles inside
15 the clay than surrounding soil, but it's an area in low
16 hydraulic conductivity, right? So it's tight.

17 There's not a lot of movement of fluid in
18 this low permeable lens. So this actually turns out to
19 be an advantage for our technology, because the
20 electricity preferentially wants to go in this area.

21 It's higher in electrical conductivity. It
22 tracks the current, and it just happens that that's where
23 the contamination is caught up. It's a low conductivity
24 area, as well.

25 Next, please.

1 So the site where we would have a
2 homogeneous sand, for example, current would flow in a
3 straight line like this, like these blue lines, but since
4 we do have these heterogeneous silts and clays, it you
5 actually goes to the area where it's got the
6 contamination.

7 And we heat up these areas slightly quicker
8 than the soil and create the conditions inside those
9 lenses to be able to get the contamination out.

10 Go ahead.

11 And the next one. So there's this law
12 called Dalton's Law of Partial Pressure. It's a
13 phenomenon, but it's -- it gets some of the contamination
14 here, too, at the Presidio.

15 If you mix the Stoddard solvent with water
16 at the subsurface, the boiling point of the contaminant
17 mixture is lower, which makes it easier for us to convert
18 it to vapor, right?

19 We don't need as much energy or as much
20 time to create that phase change, forcing it to a liquid
21 to vapor and under vacuum recovery. So it will actually
22 helps us speed up the technology.

23 We have a perfect safety record. It's an
24 important point about our technology. Safety's a very
25 top consideration for us. It's actually the top-most

1 important consideration.

2 We're using high voltage energy. We can't
3 afford for anybody to get hurt. So we actually design
4 our features and over -- design our safety in the system
5 so an actual thief that steals, tries to get in to steal
6 the copper wire will not get hurt. The system will shut
7 down automatically.

8 If an unauthorized intruder were to
9 penetrate our fence in on our site, the system will shut
10 down and notify us automatically that it's happened.

11 I think there's a motion detector inside
12 the fence inside the site here that helps us do that, and
13 then we have a safety policy that's well below the safe
14 working voltage at a site that the Occupational Safety
15 and Health Administration has designed, right?

16 Their policy is fifty volts at a site to be safe voltage.

17 Our policy is less than fifteen volts, and
18 we do that by using standard grounding techniques and
19 then routinely monitoring to make sure we're within that
20 policy, and we will not operate the site if it's above
21 that policy, okay, so we overdesign our safety system to
22 make sure nobody's hurt.

23 Here's a diagram of our electrodes. So we
24 will drill these bore holes, twelve inches outside
25 diameter. We'll insert these steel pipes that you see

1 here as the electrodes and we can actually -- the this
2 technology's also very flexible.

3 We control the energy into different
4 intervals. You can turn on the electrodes, turn them off
5 and we have a lot of flexibility.

6 We'll backfill the electrode bore hole with
7 steel shod. To improve the soil, electrode interface.
8 Go ahead. Next one.

9 And we angle these electrodes. Most of the
10 time they're vertical as they're doing here. You can
11 angle them under these structures. And we're doing sheet
12 pile now, too, so big sheets, metal sheets we'll also use
13 at sites, a couple advantages.

14 You don't have drill cutting, so it tends
15 to be less expensive. You can get more in the ground
16 than you can a bore electrode in a day, but you do have
17 to be in the groundwater for this to work because it
18 needs to stay wet.

19 We have to have moisture in the subsurface
20 for this to work. A vertical electrode will drip water
21 in to make sure it stays wet. If it dries out, then the
22 energy stops flowing, so we have to have moisture in the
23 soil.

24 Hydrolysis is another naturally occurring
25 degradation mechanism that works in the subsurface.

1 Water substitution reaction, affecting mostly these
2 oxygenated outcroppings.

3 This is just another destruction mechanism
4 that speeds up with heat. So we'll get this moving
5 quicker using heat helps us remediate a site.

6 And we're also taking advantage of bio-
7 remediation, so bacteria that's naturally occurring at a
8 site also likes to be warm, forty to fifty degrees C,
9 somewhere in that area, and we're finding out that these
10 bacteria actually do survive the temperatures that we get
11 to, and once we turn off the system, the site will cool
12 over time slowly, and this is when we're seeing these
13 bacteria become very active and even remediate the site
14 further.

15 So that the effect is over time, we're
16 seeing concentrations in the groundwater continue to
17 climb over time versus the opposite rebound that you
18 might hear about with some other technologies. We don't
19 see that happening with our site.

20 Go ahead.

21 And so we are looking at doing -- combining
22 our technology with the bioremediation and with these
23 other in-situ destruction mechanisms to provide a more --
24 a larger solution for the whole plume, not just the
25 source area. Something I should have mentioned earlier,

1 too.

2 Our focus has been on the smaller high
3 concentration source areas at a site; not the huge plume
4 that's been created from the source, but our technology's
5 been used historically to get that source cleaned up
6 quickly.

7 So you now we're seeing we can also step
8 out into the downgradient plume harnessing the bacteria
9 that's already there to help cleanup that, as well.

10 Go ahead. And one more time.

11 And that will be -- I think I actually went
12 overtime. Do you all have any other questions? Yes,
13 please.

14 MS. SUNGA: Have you done this technology
15 in an area where vegetation needs to be established?
16 Have you done any destruction or organisms necessary to
17 grow back vegetation?

18 MR. FLEMING: That's a good question. Tom
19 just did it in Goleta, California where we treated
20 underneath a facility.

21 We do this technology actually underneath
22 operating facilities, buildings, sidewalk, roads, but
23 that site actually had trees, palm trees around the
24 building, and we were able to do the remediation without
25 harming those trees.

1 But it's important to say we were fourteen
2 feet, I think, below the root system of that tree or the
3 trees and so we didn't harm them, but had we been up into
4 the root system, it could have damaged the tree.

5 MS. SUNGA: Okay. So if you want to re-
6 vegetate the area, then you have to do some more sole
7 treatment or the --

8 MR. FLEMING: Oh, oh. So if the plants
9 were to dry and then revegetate? No. I don't think you
10 would have to do any addition.

11 MR. SEELBACH: We don't change the soil
12 structures at all. Maybe reduce a little mixture. The
13 only impact of vegetation would be the leftover heat,
14 which you would have to wait for it too cool off.

15 MS. SUNGA: If you raise the steam level
16 too high and most of the organisms won't grow, some of
17 them necessary to grow vegetation maybe die.

18 You want to wait -- can it establish
19 naturally after a while?

20 MR. SOMETHING: That will be my guess.
21 You want the moisture to return to ambient levels. That
22 can be a year before it gets back to an ambient
23 temperatures occur.

24 MR. BECK: They only go to a hundred
25 degrees C, so it doesn't break down the organic carbon in

1 the soil. There could be some bacteria that -- that die
2 during the process, but they generally regenerate is what
3 they've seen and actually come back even stronger.

4 MR. FLEMING: We've found in our sites
5 that through the action of heating and some of the
6 agitation I think that occurs in the subsurface during
7 heating, it actually helps to release some of the
8 naturally occurring carbons that's attached to the soil
9 particles and actually creates it into the water; helps
10 it to transfer the water coming volubilized in the water
11 making it available for the bacteria to actually access
12 in heat uses the foot source.

13 So in that sense, we improved the
14 environment, for the bacteria to live and operate. Good
15 question.

16 Yeah.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm also interested to
18 know what your data showed.

19 MR. FLEMING: Yes.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Were there any anomaly
21 situations, any intrusions of your fence, equipment
22 breakdown, anything of that nature?

23 MR. FLEMING: John would know.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: I just asked if there
25 were any out of the ordinary or anomalous situations that

1 occurred, like equipment breakdowns or people intruding.

2 MR. BECK: On this site? No, not at all.

3 With the exception of the Internet going down

4 occasionally.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: I was curious about this.

6 Is there any peripheral disruption of underground

7 transmission lines or telecommunication lines or what not

8 within the proximity of the system?

9 MR. FLEMING: Yeah. That's a good

10 question.

11 MR. GUY: The generating radius.

12 MR. SOMETHING: We've done some work

13 around sensitive utilities. We're doing that here.

14 Maybe not sensitive is the right word, but definitely

15 temperature sensitive.

16 We haven't seen EMF fields distort

17 utilities, and we've done several projects with. In

18 fact, the job in Goleta, they had a very sensitive lift

19 station that was for the entire process. That was

20 critical that we kept that running.

21 So we did some EMF monitoring and some of

22 the monitoring of that system to make sure.

23 The biggest impact that we could have would

24 be heat, and we needed to be aware of what's in the

25 vicinity and what you're heating.

1 MR. BECK: There are a couple utilities
2 close to our treatment area here and we've installed
3 temperature monitoring probes to monitor the temperature.

4 So every morning we get a temperature.
5 Could be more frequently than that, but generally we look
6 at it in the day to make sure we're okay.

7 MS. BLUM: It's pretty far out, but I'll
8 ask it. Anyway, I was thinking about oil spills and
9 wondering if this would have an application for cleaning
10 up oil spills in a body of water.

11 MR. FLEMING: Probably not.

12 MS. BLUM: Too expensive.

13 MR. FLEMING: No body of water.

14 MR. SOMETHING: I think you would have a
15 less likely costly alternative that would be more
16 applicable.

17 MR. FLEMING: Not a good choice.

18 MR. SOMETHING: My guess.

19 MR. FLEMING: Not far out there. Good
20 question.

21 MR. SOMETHING: If they could gather all
22 that up and put it in a big pile, we might be able to do
23 something with it, but nothing.

24 MR. FLEMING: We were actually looking at
25 doing that down in the golf whether the big oil spill

1 happened. Once they brought in the oil gum.

2 MS. BLUM: Oh, I see.

3 MR. FLEMING: And dug up the beach, we
4 were talking with, where that would be loaded in cells,
5 but that never happened.

6 MS. BLUM: Maybe next year.

7 MR. FLEMING: Thank you all.

8 MR. BECK: Okay. So I'm just going to go
9 from there and kind of bring it to the site here and
10 remind you guys that I was here back in the spring, but
11 I'll remind you guys how this technology's been applied
12 to our specific site.

13 So this is the retaining wall and historic
14 building 228 on the left and the Stoddard solvent tanks
15 were located between the building and the retaining wall,
16 and that's where the main release was, but we've detected
17 Stoddard solvents in thirty or forty feet in either
18 direction east and west and up to fifteen feet north of
19 the wall.

20 So there's a pretty good area of impact
21 here that we've been trying to address, and the plan that
22 TRS developed for our site consists of 41 electrodes, and
23 the electrodes show up in four different rows and the two
24 rows south of the wall at the higher elevation are co-
25 located with vertical extraction points, the upside down

1 monitoring well that Dave mentioned.

2 But below the wall, because groundwater is
3 only two feet below ground surface, we had to do
4 something somewhat out of the ordinary. We did that at a
5 couple other sites.

6 We utilized horizontal extraction points.
7 The two large rectangles flowing between the circles
8 represent that, and I'm going to show you a few photos of
9 how that all came together.

10 But before we started, we did -- the Trust
11 got a power drop. They facilitated some electrical lines
12 coming off the grid to this site to generate the power
13 that we need.

14 We got the air permit that we talked about
15 before from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District,
16 and we got a permit from the San Francisco Public
17 Utilities Commission for discharging condensate water
18 that generated during the process.

19 When the steam comes out, they cool it off.
20 Water condenses and that water is discharged. We
21 discharge it to the sanitary sewer, and the treatment is
22 performed in an catalytic oxidizeer, as we mentioned,
23 which is permitted by the Air Board.

24 So this is during construction, and it
25 shows the horizontal extraction wells that I mentioned.

1 So you can see the electrodes are the vertical things
2 with the white caps, and then the horizontal wells travel
3 between them, and this is a close-up.

4 They use a seal slotted pipe adjacent to
5 the well where it's hottest and then they transition to
6 chlorinated PVC between those, and covered them with
7 crushed rock, and then ultimately use an insulated -- the
8 blueish material there is -- I think it's Styrofoam.

9 Is it Styrofoam?

10 MR. BECK: Some kind of foam. It's a foam
11 insulator. They've wired up some of the electrodes with
12 a cable, and then the white material is the hose that
13 they use to drip water into the electrodes when they dry
14 out, and the vertical point, we would have a third hose,
15 which would be an extract -- air extraction point, but at
16 this point, it's extracted below, and then over the top,
17 a layer of plastic with the sand bags create a seal, and
18 they draw air out of that, and that's how the vapor --
19 vapors are extracted below the wall.

20 So this shows the care that they took to
21 prevent damage to the wall. There's a lot of piping
22 going on.

23 On the right-hand side, you can see another
24 row of electrodes with cables and water tubes, and then
25 also the -- the gray piping is where the air is extracted

1 and it's all come to a common header and over the wall to
2 the treatment system.

3 They built supports of unit strut and
4 there's really nothing touching the wall at all. You can
5 see the number of unusual cables coming down and the
6 piping.

7 So the question is: Does it work?

8 And so on October 27th -- I guess that's
9 about two weeks ago now -- we collected a round of
10 samples. We were at this -- just about two-thirds of the
11 way through our design power -- amount of power that
12 we're expecting to use.

13 We collected three samples below the wall
14 and three samples above the wall, and we went to
15 locations intentionally where we had sampled before to
16 see a difference, and you can see right now that we're
17 not going to be able to read this very well on the
18 screen. I'll just describe what we've got.

19 So the results are good. This location
20 here, gasoline was 21,000 milligrams per kilogram
21 beforehand.

22 It's non-detect now, under one part per
23 million. I'll start with the three that did best.

24 This one up here was in the 34,000 part per
25 million range and it's down to two, so we did really good

1 at those locations.

2 This one was in the 10,000 part per million
3 range. It's down to five. So clearly we've done a good
4 job at reducing those, and there's a reason why we were
5 most effective at those.

6 They're further away from the source area,
7 probably less prevalent at those locations, and there's a
8 challenge up in the upper right-hand corner here due to
9 the presence of waste oil or fuel from a former waste oil
10 tank.

11 The presence of diesel and motor oil can
12 actually slow down the effectiveness of this -- this
13 technology, and it's something we tested in advance
14 because we were concerned about it.

15 So we're not surprised that a little slower
16 in that area, but still -- we had at this location, we
17 had on the order of 10,000 parts per million. We're down
18 to 240. Our goal is a hundred, so we're almost there.

19 At this location, there is initial data
20 posted, but we were in the 10,000 parts per million range
21 there. We did our bench scale test.

22 We're at 430 now, so we're still getting
23 close, and then the location right where the tank was is
24 lagging behind a little bit. We were in the 13,000 part
25 per million range before. We're at 1,700 now.

1 So, you know, we still have -- as of that
2 date had thirty percent of our energy to put into the
3 ground, and I think we're -- things are looking good.

4 We intend to back the week after
5 Thanksgiving with the hope that our second round of
6 samples from this location will all be below cleanup
7 goals and we will be finished.

8 I'll point out, though, we are not
9 remediating the diesel and the motor oil that are
10 present. That wasn't the intention, and we were clear
11 during our -- our work plan stage that we're target go
12 the gasoline with this technology, and there may be some
13 December December diesel and motor oil that need to be
14 dealt with in the land use control, but we haven't seen
15 diesel and motor oil in groundwater at the site, so even
16 before the remediation, so -- we're not even about
17 impacts from that. So that's -- those are the results.

18 Any questions at all? Go ahead.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: The number that was the
20 starting point --

21 MR. BECK: Yeah.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: -- was that a current test
23 before you started or was it the start data?

24 MR. BECK: So they were collected either
25 in 2009 or 2010 --

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh.

2 MR. BECK: -- by us.

3 There was some older data that was done
4 well before that, but all of these locations were done by
5 AMEC in the last two years.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you.

7 MR. GUY: How effective is the electrode
8 treatment for contaminated soil that's under a body of
9 water? One presumably too large to pump out and treat?
10 Is that possible?

11 MR. BECK: So you're talking about
12 sediments below.

13 MR. GUY: Right.

14 MR. BECK: A body of water.

15 MR. SOMETHING: We have actually done
16 sites that were full of water.

17 MR. FLEMING: So they drain the pond,
18 install the electrode and operate it that way.

19 MR. GUY: So --

20 MR. FLEMING: A natural body of water
21 would be tough unless you can drain it. Good question.

22 MR. BECK: Any other questions? Yeah,
23 Doug.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Some years ago, we did
25 a gasoline site down by the commissary and that was

1 building 640.

2 MR. BECK: Mm-hmm.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: And there were all
4 these utilities and it was kind of a Peace Corps
5 excavation.

6 And my recollection of that is we thought
7 everything was cleaned up, and then the marsh was
8 constructed, and once there was this large area of kind
9 of a sink for groundwater to flow into, it began to pull
10 water -- more water from that site and suddenly we could
11 smell petroleum products and there was a whole area that
12 was -- had not been anticipated.

13 I'm just wondering in advance of
14 deconstructing all of this, you're going to do a mass
15 excavation sometime later.

16 Have you thought about what if we didn't
17 get some piece of this, but then we pulled out all of our
18 equipment, we brought it up or we pulled out all the
19 probes or electrodes?

20 I'm just wondering if it might be some reason
21 to think about what if we miss something and we dig this
22 out, we create a sink and then start sucking in this area
23 of hydrocarbons that we didn't get.

24 MR. BECK: Okay. Well, fair question. I
25 think we're going to be confident after the second round

1 of data.

2 The results are all six, we have three good
3 ones now, that we've done all we can with the area our
4 electrodes are designed to get after.

5 So, you know, there's no fear that we're
6 pulling up the equipment and leaving.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

8 MR. BECK: And we feel pretty comfortable
9 that we've gotten the bulk of the mass out of here, and
10 you're right. We're going to be back.

11 This dashed line obviously is the edge of
12 excavation for building 231, so it starts five feet off
13 the wall and slopes down to the wand. So there won't be
14 any hiding any residual contamination.

15 We certainly want to be careful and make
16 sure we get it all out.

17 MS. FANELLI: I think that's an
18 interesting point, Doug.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Just a thought.

20 MS. FANELLI: I think maybe we need to
21 think about the value of some exploratory trenches
22 downgradient why we might be doing the future dig, if we
23 can, and get a sense of what the seepage looks like if we
24 see anything before we completely deactivate the system.

25 MR. BECK: We haven't changed the

1 hydraulics much. We have been boiling water, but I don't
2 think we've lowered the water table, per se.

3 Is that a fair statement?

4 FACILITATOR KERN: I don't think you would
5 really notice it until we've maybe did you go everything
6 out.

7 MR. BECK: Before we start going through,
8 because we are going to change the gradient there. No
9 question about that.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Just food for thought.
11 There's tremendous results, wow, from the 10,000 to 200.

12 MR. BECK: Yeah.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Or two or zero. So
14 that's good.

15 MS. BLUM: Since this is so close to
16 quartermaster reach, I remember some fragment of
17 conversation to say they were going to build up a berm or
18 water to protect the Quartermaster Reach from any
19 potential leaching or contamination.

20 Was there any -- am I making that up?

21 MS. FANELLI: I think before we lighted on
22 this technology, we talked about in-situ barrier walls
23 and things like that, so I don't think you're making it
24 up.

25 MR. BECK: We had a lot of discussions

1 about different technologies before we landed on this
2 one.

3 MS. BLUM: So if you were to give this a
4 percentile in terms of effectiveness, where would it be?

5 MR. BECK: As far as how far we are along?

6 MS. BLUM: Well, in terms of not con -- if
7 it was -- how much of it do you feel like you can clean
8 up so there wouldn't be a potential to contaminate
9 Quartermaster Reach?

10 MR. BECK: Yeah. We're going to be pretty
11 close to complete removal. That's the benefit of this
12 technology over some of the other in-situ things where
13 Dave was talking about, mass stuck in clay.

14 We can't get it out. We don't have that.
15 So I think that's one of the reasons we chose the
16 technology.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: So the project's about two-
18 thirds done?

19 MR. BECK: Right. So it was as of October
20 27th. We're going to go back December 1st. We'll take a
21 few days to get the results back.

22 If the results are like we hope, we'll be
23 shutting off the season system.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: And does the rainy season
25 affect it?

1 MR. BECK: Not really. It's watertight.

2 MR. SEELBACH: If anybody's interested in
3 visiting the site, TRS is doing a workshop tomorrow, and
4 that workshop is going to end with a -- 2:30; is that
5 right.

6 MR. FLEMING: About 12:30, one o'clock,
7 we're going to be coming out to the site.

8 MR. SEELBACH: Okay. If you guys want to
9 stop by.

10 MR. FLEMING: You're welcome to come by,
11 look at what we're doing, tour them and show what's going
12 on. You all are welcome to join us.

13 MR. SEELBACH: That's between 1:00 and
14 2:00.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: I can't.

16 MR. SEELBACH: Yeah. It's kind of a lot.

17 MS. BLUM: I'd like to.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: We certainly want to
19 thank everyone for coming to this meeting tonight. We
20 know you have your other meeting tomorrow, but whatever
21 coordination was done to arrange these so we could hear
22 your presentation, we appreciate it. Thanks very much.

23 MR. FLEMING: You're welcome. Thank you.

24 MS. FANELLI: Unless anybody has slides,
25 I'll let Mike shut the projector.

1 MR. FLEMING: We'll take off.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: You're absolutely
3 welcome to --

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Very, it's very
5 interesting.

6 MS. KRAMER: So what happens to the motor
7 oil and diesel that's there?

8 MS. FANELLI: We will not. That comes
9 that -- that comes out with excavation and will be
10 removed physically. The residual that's left after the
11 treatment will stay and will slowly degrade over time
12 through natural bioremediation.

13 But the -- as Mike pointed out, we don't
14 see any of those constituents in groundwater. So we know
15 that it's a localized soil issue, but it's not impacting
16 water quality.

17 Item B.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good, question.

19 MS. FANELLI: I saw that you -- I got my
20 report out early and we are trying to -- since we're
21 getting close to the end of the remediation program, we
22 are doing our review of our projects on a more frequent
23 basis, and I was able to get this quarterly report out a
24 little bit earlier. But I wasn't prepared to give you
25 the whole nine yards presentation on it. But I will be

1 to next month.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: No problem.

3 MS. FANELLI: Jan sent me a couple of
4 questions. When we do our reviews, we check our
5 estimates at completion and our estimation to complete
6 our projects and we increased the budgets for two
7 projects, one being the project you just saw, 207/231,
8 and we increased that budget by close to two million
9 dollars, 1.9 million dollars.

10 The primary driver of that cost increase
11 was a change in assumption on the waste classification of
12 the soil that we take out of the 230/231.

13 We had historically assumed that that soil
14 would test as class II, non-hazardous material.

15 We had the experience of getting rid of the
16 drill cuttings from the electrodes that you saw, and they
17 tested as Cal haz waste, so we thought it was prudent to
18 go back to our estimate and put in some higher assumption
19 on waste classification. So that's the driver on those
20 costs.

21 In addition, if you remember, we were going
22 to do an in-situ chemical treatment here. Thermal
23 treatment was actually a little bit more expensive than
24 those earlier estimates, and so that bumped us up, and
25 when we did 207, we took out a little bit more dirt than

1 we thought we were going to. So all these things
2 incrementally led us to an increase.

3 But the vast majority of the estimate is to
4 handle the potential for a higher waste classification
5 than what we had before.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: So instead of 6.8, it's
7 7.8.

8 MS. FANELLI: I went back to get my
9 quarterly report because I knew someone was going to ask
10 me a specific number and I would need to have it.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Sorry.

12 MS. FANELLI: No, no. That's why I have
13 it.

14 207/231, our estimate at completion is now
15 8.7 million dollars. That is project cost. That's from
16 inception.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

18 MS. FANELLI: That includes the work at
19 207/231.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: We have about another year
21 of work on this?

22 MS. FANELLI: I'm hoping that we get the
23 vast majority out, as Ryan said, next spring. We're
24 working hard with Caltrans, as you know. Caltrans is
25 going to have what they call a private/public

1 partnership, P3 partnership going to complete the work,
2 and we're trying to get in so that we can get that soil
3 excavated this calendar year.

4 The sooner the better, but we're not sure
5 if it's going to be spring or summer.

6 The other project that the increase was
7 Baker Beach 1A. That increased about \$800,000. Most of
8 those costs are primarily planning costs, and they are to
9 complete the RI, FS and design documents.

10 If you remember that project was originally
11 costed many, many years ago when the concept was it was
12 140 cubic yard pile of asphaltic material.

13 We did incremental increases, but we did a
14 large increase to account for the volume of material that
15 we thought we were going to have to haul out from 140
16 yards to more like 10,000 yards I believe earlier in the
17 calendar year, and then we went back and increased the
18 planning costs.

19 So Angela had -- I don't know if you all
20 met Angela, but Angela, the project manager, had earlier
21 in increased the construction, but she didn't think about
22 the design associated with that.

23 So this most recent increase was in design
24 and coordination of planning costs.

25 We've added things like the historical

1 assessment, because the soil is part of the historic
2 batteries, and we're more likely going to do some further
3 assessment of that before we remove the soil so that
4 we're in compliance with the National Historic
5 Preservation Act, et cetera. So that was the driver.

6 You'll likely see an increase in the
7 landfill E cost for the next quarter. We've used most of
8 our contingency.

9 The reason the costs went up specifically
10 for our estimate is we had hoped to have more Doyle Drive
11 soil to use for our cover from their excavations, and
12 that didn't occur because P3 didn't excavate the northern
13 tunnel.

14 So we actually processed and improperly
15 imported more soil than we thought from the Miller Road
16 site. So there will be some cost increases associated
17 with that project.

18 I don't think we'll see real significance
19 ones over the budget, but we'll see a little bit.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: If I might go back to
21 the increase due to the Cal haz waste --

22 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: -- because of the
24 drilling that you noticed, was that due to the solvents
25 or was that due to some other metal or something in the

1 soil?

2 MR. SEELBACH: It was lead in the soil.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Lead in the soil.

4 MS. FANELLI: Lead is the bugaboo. You
5 don't have to have very much lead and it can easily be
6 soluble per the web test.

7 I think naturally occurring lead can be
8 soluble for the web test.

9 MR. BECK: It's notable there. Very low
10 concentrations of lead will be Cal haz level.

11 MR. SEELBACH: Well below our cleanup
12 level.

13 MS. FANELLI: So that's all I have on B.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Can I ask one more
15 question?

16 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: This is the last quarterly
18 report. I just happened to bring that. I was looking at
19 landfill 10.

20 Are we about ready to close that?

21 MS. FANELLI: The cost on landfill 10,
22 that was art sort of an artifact, and I tried to explain
23 that.

24 We -- because of the limitations of our
25 accounting system, Oracle, to make our jobs easier,

1 sometimes we have special account that's not assigned to
2 a project, and so we'll spend those dollars, but then we
3 have to do a reclassification.

4 So what that cost was was simply a
5 reclassification of a previous cost.

6 But very we are close to completing that
7 project, but we don't have a lot of significant cost
8 left, other than the ongoing groundwater monitoring per
9 the RAP.

10 We have the construction completion report
11 in draft. It's under review with the Park Service at
12 this point. We're planning on actually presenting it to
13 DTSC in December and walking through the components of
14 it, and then leave it with them for their review.

15 We repaired those two little soil boils in
16 June and Brian as contractor replanted recently, and so I
17 think we're pretty much done there.

18 We are going to continue to monitoring in a
19 swift context that site, though, this coming year.

20 So we're preparing the O&M plan, the
21 construction site, we do have the land use document, and
22 all of those components will go to DTSC for their review
23 with the hopes that once they meet DTSC's requirements,
24 then DTSC can certify the site, and we'll do whatever
25 ongoing monitoring or maintenance under an O&M agreement

1 with the Department.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you.

3 MS. FANELLI: You're welcome.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Any questions?

5 We'll be having another agenda item on this
6 coming up at a future RAB meeting.

7 MS. FANELLI: I'll get you some nice
8 photographs now that we're completed with E and 1 and 2.
9 I'll have some updates and photographs and give you the
10 normal presentation.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

12 Moving on to item 4C. This is the site
13 outside of the 6A, which is the -- I'm spacing on the
14 name.

15 MS. BLUM: Thompson's Reach.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: There's a large area.
17 I can only remember the remediation names. I can't
18 remember the new names as I go forward.

19 We're just curious around what's the
20 thinking of everything around the outside of that.

21 I know over the years, we've done a variety
22 of, you know, different tests and there's been discussion
23 around a lot of it's fill, could have low levels.

24 What is the thinking at this point around
25 that site?

1 MS. FANELLI: Well, we've actually pushed
2 6B along with Howe Wagner a little back in our
3 schedule --

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. FANELLI: -- primarily because they're
6 being done which AMEC and we've been keeping Mike busy on
7 the 228 project that you just reviewed.

8 So we're in the process of actually taking
9 all of this past site data and compiling it into an RI
10 report. Similar to what we've done these days on all of
11 our sites, landfill E, fillsite 1, landfill 2, Baker
12 Beach 1A, Baker Beach 2 writing a Comprehensive Remedial
13 Investigation report.

14 We're targeting having that report
15 completed in January time frame.

16 Fillsite 6B is defined as the area that has
17 debris from the demolition of the former Army Letterman
18 hospital.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

20 MS. FANELLI: And we obviously know where
21 the footprints of those former buildings were. They were
22 in fillsite 6A that was remediated in the past long
23 before I was with the Trust, and then in the areas
24 surrounding it.

25 As we evaluate that data, we're looking to

1 see if there's any data gaps, is there anything else that
2 we have to do, but if presumed remedy at this point is a
3 manage in place remedy.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: One of the thoughts
5 that comes up around that site is -- that I've always
6 wondered. I don't know that we've ever thought about
7 it -- was across the street from Thompson Reach, YMCA
8 parking lot and headed up that way, if there might have
9 been impacts in that direction, but with the Lincoln
10 there, it just didn't kind of go that way.

11 It's got to be filled, the YMCA parking
12 lot, and then that -- the dust bowl area.

13 MS. FANELLI: There should be lots of area
14 of fill like that. There were no buildings associated
15 with the Letterman Hospital complex in that area, and to
16 my knowledge, the data that we looked at doesn't indicate
17 any demolition debris in that fill.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

19 MR. BECK: That was right.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Thank you.

21 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

22 MS. BLUM: I remember the land use, the
23 expected land use for this 6B.

24 Is that going to be housing?

25 MS. FANELLI: 6B covers a large area.

1 It's -- there's some apartment -- is it Swords for
2 Plowshares Apartments on 6B. There's a lot of commercial
3 buildings on 6B.

4 MS. BLUM: Okay.

5 MR. BECK: 6B also includes the footprint
6 of the Quartermaster Reach --

7 MS. FANELLI: Right.

8 MR. BECK: -- project that we'll be
9 extending, the 6A and the marsh.

10 MS. FANELLI: It's on the eastern side.

11 MR. BECK: You've got commercial,
12 residential and some ecologically sensitive areas.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good.

14 The next two items, the Mountain Lake
15 Remedial Investigation and the RAB letter to DTSC, I had
16 something in mind with those.

17 I didn't necessarily anticipate that you
18 would be here tonight, so I'm so happy that DTSC is here.

19 So I'd like to kind of alter my thinking a
20 little bit. Part of the thought for 4D, the Mountain
21 Lake Remedial Investigation would be to talk about and
22 prepare our questions for the meeting that we knew that
23 you would be at on the 16th, and so given that you're
24 here, I'm wondering what the best use of the time would
25 be.

1 There are a variety of things that we
2 thought we might go through to -- to make inquiries, and
3 maybe the best way is just to check in with you guys
4 about the meeting on the 16th.

5 What do you anticipate is going to be the
6 flow of the meeting? Anything different from the last
7 meeting that we had here?

8 So I'll just check in with you about that
9 meeting and maybe that can inform us a little bit about
10 how we would prepare for that.

11 MS. SUNGA: Based on our meeting earlier,
12 the format that we discussed that we would be having.
13 Everybody knows the meeting is Wednesday next week and
14 should have gotten a copy of the invitation that was sent
15 out I think on the 27th.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

17 MS. SUNGA: And.

18 MS. FANELLI: It's in this building. I'm
19 not quite sure this room.

20 MS. SUNGA: The format will be the same
21 format that we had last time, but this time, we will be
22 having a conference, people to do our presentation that
23 work along the roadside and the roadside for mitigation
24 work.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Very nice.

1 MS. SUNGA: We'll be doing that again,
2 since there will be other new people that will be
3 attending that didn't attend last time, and then we'll go
4 with the RI, which is a little bit more shorter than last
5 time because we will be having Caltrans do the last
6 presentation.

7 And then after that, we'll be allowing some
8 time for people to entertain some questions after the
9 meeting, if people have questions about all the work that
10 DTSC is doing, will be doing and Trust doing and contract
11 is doing, and then we will be having some tables and
12 there's some poster boards, and then we will be manning
13 for the areas and people wanting to -- one person.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Excellent.

15 MS. SUNGA: That's what we will be doing.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: All right.

17 MS. SUNGA: So if you want to wait until
18 that time.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, with Caltrans
20 being there, I know there were questions. Some of the
21 questions we might have for Caltrans would be related to
22 the outtake pipe.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, and the type that
24 goes to the Richmond Transport System, the --

25 MS. FANELLI: I think the subjects for

1 Caltrans on this will be the issues that we have related
2 to the remediation. So a little bit of the diversion and
3 the road stability. That's where our primary
4 coordination has been.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

6 MS. FANELLI: I don't think that they'll
7 be prepared to talk about the actual overflow pipeline
8 because it's not directly related to the remediation.

9 At that point, you can certainly ask them
10 questions about that, but --

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: So they're going to discuss
12 the stability in relation to the depth of the excavation?

13 MS. FANELLI: That's correct, yeah. The
14 Trust has been coordinating with Caltrans and we haven't
15 been talking about it, are still a little bit guarded.

16 Our consent agreement is basically signed
17 by most of the various parties that need to sign up. It
18 needs to be posted publicly.

19 We do anticipate that happening in the very
20 near future. I'm talking days or a week. So that we can
21 then -- that will become a public document, the consent
22 decree and it will be very clear what the issues are and
23 how we're going to move ahead -- with not only
24 remediation, but with the pipelines -- some of the other
25 issues because it's laid out in that document.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

2 MS. FANELLI: But we have been working
3 with Caltrans on highway issues associated with the
4 remediation, and the point is to talk about that at this
5 meeting relative to the planned remediation.

6 So the Trust is in the process -- Genevieve
7 is in the process of working on the FS/RAP, and I believe
8 that's going to be the primary focus of our presentation
9 at the meeting.

10 MS. BLUM: Eileen, presumably -- I suspect
11 that this is a different Caltrans team that's working on
12 the rebuild of Doyle Drive, but that they are closely
13 communicating.

14 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure they're
15 different people. They may be some of the same.

16 MS. BLUM: That might be a plus if they
17 were working on Doyle Drive because they already know the
18 millions of details that go on here and how the
19 construction might affect whatever it is that they do
20 with Mountain Lake, even though that's a far away piece
21 from the transect or whatever that thing's called.

22 MS. SUNGA: David Yam was the project
23 manager for Mountain Lakes.

24 MS. TSUJI: He has indicated -- he's
25 indicated he has been in communication with folks working

1 on Doyle Drive and trying to coordinate what work needs
2 to be done as well as, you know, kind of a tightening of
3 everybody hitting the roadways with their truckloads of
4 dirt all in the same day.

5 So there is coordination going on
6 internally within Caltrans. That's my understanding.

7 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm curious as to
9 whether it would be advantageous for us, for example, if
10 people had questions around well, the draining of the
11 lake versus not draining of the lake, which is the better
12 way, and could you drain it through that pipe.

13 I'm getting that maybe you've been dealing
14 with all that and thinking through those possibilities.

15 MS. FANELLI: We have been.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Are those questions
17 that you would want to be able to deal with at this
18 meeting?

19 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We can address that.
20 We're working with Caltrans on those issues.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: All right.

22 MS. BLUM: I have some questions. Should
23 I send those to you? How should we handle it?

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Well --

25 MS. BLUM: Because I'm not going to have

1 fifteen minutes of time at the meeting. I know that.

2 MS. FANELLI: If you have anything
3 specific, I would -- feel free for you to e-mail
4 Genevieve or Medi and maybe we can address them as part
5 of the presentation --

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

7 MS. FANELLI: -- if you have something
8 that --

9 FACILITATOR KERN: So I would really
10 encourage people to do that, because that offer, let's
11 get as many of these kinds of questions to Eileen or to
12 Medi and -- we'll just copy everybody.

13 MS. FANELLI: Copy everybody. I would say
14 Genevieve. I can't volunteer Medi.

15 MS. TSUJI: Medi.

16 MS. FANELLI: I'll volunteer Genevieve.

17 MS. BLUM: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: I think that maybe we
19 can do a little bit of outreach to the people that we
20 know within the other community organizations that we
21 have connections with.

22 I know that I've been in discussions with
23 the former president of the Mountain Lake Park folks,
24 Friends of Mountain Lake Park and they're -- they were
25 wondering, you know, what to be prepared for the meeting.

1 So this is very helpful.

2 Maybe we can encourage them to even get
3 some questions to you in advance.

4 MS. SUNGA: The invitation was mailed out
5 to a number of residents.

6 MS. FANELLI: I think nine hundred
7 residents got copies of this invite. So it could be
8 quite a large meeting. I'm not sure how many will --
9 there was no RSVP required.

10 So that's why it will be likely in the big
11 room depending on how many people.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

13 MS. CHEEVER: I'm just wondering, were
14 residents invited by mail or e-mail?

15 MS. SUNGA: Mail.

16 MS. FANELLI: And there should be several
17 signs posted at Mountain Lake Park, and then there was an
18 e-mail that also went out.

19 So people might have gotten it two ways, if
20 they go through the park and see the posting.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Do you know how long the
22 meeting might last?

23 MS. SUNGA: We allotted two hours. 6:30
24 to 8:30. So one and a half hour presentation and Q&A and
25 then a half hour for the bulletin board and questions.

1 I think people from the restoration will be
2 there, too.

3 MS. FANELLI: That's right. So we're
4 hoping DTSC will have their process and be able to speak
5 to that.

6 The remediation program will have our
7 engineers' preliminary work on issues of transportation,
8 truck routes, how we're thinking that this will play out
9 in terms of the remediation.

10 I know that Terri, who's back there, is
11 planning to have information on the subsequent on the
12 subsequent enhancement plans and program, and then
13 Caltrans will have some information about what their
14 thoughts are on the work that they need to do to
15 facilitate remediation.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: I think there is a
17 question that we would have asked then, but it might be
18 better to ask now. It's a little bit more of a technical
19 question on the RI risk assessment.

20 One question that I had is in the risk
21 assessment, there are several scenarios of the risk. I
22 don't know if that's the best way to describe it.

23 How much risk would be remaining if we did
24 the cleanup and left certain pieces behind? For example,
25 if there was -- due to constraints of the road, we

1 couldn't excavate out some pieces, what would be the
2 risk, that sort of thing.

3 What's been the Department's reaction to
4 those scenarios? How are those going to be really used
5 in practice, do you think?

6 MS. SUNGA: We have not provided detailed
7 comments on that, in the RI document. We said in our
8 comment, we will be looking at that closely when we get
9 the FS/RAP.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

11 MS. SUNGA: There was a document that was
12 provided maybe to the DTSC that our toxicologist looked
13 at, and based on his evaluation of the potential risk out
14 there, it's kind of -- I think to kind of sum it up, he
15 doesn't see at this time an evidence of actual risk to
16 ecological resources at this time, even though there's
17 high concentration, but there's no study of anything that
18 show that there's an existing ecological risk.

19 Because we screen it out using the most
20 conservative cleanup number for eco, and then once you
21 get that -- use that number, that's pretty conservative
22 enough to make maybe DTSC risk management decision that
23 it will be protective.

24 You don't have to go through a full-blown
25 risk evaluation, risk assessment to generate your

1 specific cleanup number for a site.

2 In some cases, when you say -- if you do
3 the initial screening with the most conservative number,
4 you make some proponents or partners that want through a
5 full-blown risk assessment to see if they could have a
6 different number, and in most cases, it will be a high
7 number.

8 MS. TSUJI: A lot of what you asked about,
9 leave it behind or not, will be a management design, not
10 the risk assessment.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Sure.

12 MS. TSUJI: You do your evaluation, say,
13 you know, at this number, this is what the health risk
14 could be to human health or ecological risk.

15 Then the second half of risk management is
16 the risk decision-making. Do we allow it to leave
17 behind.

18 If we do allow it to be left behind, what
19 is the risk and do we need to do anything above and
20 beyond just leaving it behind.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

22 MS. TSUJI: For example, a parking lot,
23 you just don't have the bare contaminated soil there. We
24 like to cover it up with an asphalt.

25 So that would be part of the risk

1 management decision-making.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm.

3 MS. TSUJI: And that usually comes out in
4 the feas -- the feasibility study kind of weighs that
5 out --

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

7 MS. TSUJI: -- and discusses those various
8 options.

9 And another component of do you allow it to
10 be left behind or not are part of the nine criteria that
11 I always refer back to, like if it's next to the building
12 foundation, next to the roadway in this case, in order to
13 remove it, you know, we would lose Park Presidio
14 Boulevard. We can't let that happen.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

16 MS. TSUJI: So that is -- part of the
17 decision-making on part of the Department is okay. We
18 take it out. We lose Park Presidio. So we're going to
19 leave it behind. What additional remediation activities
20 need to be done to allow that to be left behind.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

22 MS. TSUJI: It may be out of lack of any
23 other terminology, tapping. We may be bringing in clean
24 material to cover and encapsulate the sediments that
25 remain.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Mm-hmm. I see.

2 I really appreciate that distinction,
3 because when I saw the risk assessment and these
4 different options, I was just wondering how that would be
5 used practically or if there would be something else in a
6 future document well, this is -- that was just for
7 everybody's consideration. This is what we're going to
8 do, or -- and then of course when you -- typically is the
9 case, there's usually some sort of surprise once we start
10 digging.

11 So --

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: So the feasibility study in
13 this case will account for the land restoration? In
14 other words, if you were going to dig the lake ten feet
15 deep, that either side you could lead in with the
16 remediation, but that will be taken out later with the
17 restoration.

18 MS. FANELLI: Restoration portion will not
19 be in the RAP. The Trust may indeed -- coordination
20 right now. Terri and her group are reviewing our
21 thoughts as we're developing them in the FS, and part of
22 the meeting is for us to present those thoughts in a
23 public forum about what we think we're removing or not
24 removing to make the lake safe from an ecological
25 standpoint from the lead, and Terri's group has been

1 reviewing our thoughts and we've been working internally
2 back and forth to see what's the best coordination for
3 the enhancement versus the remediation.

4 Is the remediationss component achieving
5 the majority of the enhancement, there's some other
6 opportunities to do further enhancement.

7 The document and the RAP would really only
8 talk about the remediation portion. My understanding is
9 it doesn't limit the Trust from doing additional if we
10 wanted to for other reasons.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Thank you.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: I suppose related to
13 the whatever is eventually decided, given the tension
14 between the sampling and just getting on with the
15 cleanup, I'm still trying to visualize the advantages and
16 disadvantages of a dry, you know, draining the leak and
17 doing the cleanup versus doing the digging with the water
18 still in the lake, and I'm wondering where that is.

19 I mean, I could offer my questions or maybe
20 you could just tell me, but the -- the question that I
21 have is I'm imagining a clamshell digger and hoisting
22 things out and all this water pouring out and perhaps the
23 sediment with the lead in it kind of flowing out of
24 the -- this bombshell -- that's what I'm imagining and
25 sort of recontaminating the lake in one case.

1 And so I'm just curious if it goes that
2 way, how would that be -- or do I just have it wrong?

3 MS. FANELLI: I think I have to really
4 defer to the engineers, because you're asking kind of
5 technical questions about the mechanics, and I know that
6 we've evaluating various types of wet excavation --

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

8 MS. FANELLI: -- dredging that include
9 clamshell and hydraulic and others.

10 The best way to get at that will be at the
11 next meeting, because the engineers that are evaluating
12 different methodologies will have different information
13 on it.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I see. Those are the
15 questions I have. I really appreciate you being here
16 tonight. It will help organizations to send along
17 questions in advance and be ready for the meeting.

18 MS. SUNGA: I would like to announce that
19 Angela Manchet has retired from DTSC. She filled in for
20 Monica for her one-month vacation.

21 She will be coming back and doing all the
22 public participation.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Any other
24 questions on Mountain Lake? And the meeting is
25 Wednesday, November 16th, next week.

1 MS. FANELLI: Is it 6:00 or 7:00?

2 MS. TSUJI: 6:30.

3 MS. FANELLI: 6:30.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Moving on to new
5 business, the RAB letter to DTSC on the PAHs, I do have a
6 letter, and then I learned from Radhika that someone
7 might be here tonight, so I decided not to copy it and
8 see if you were here, we could just talk instead of send
9 you a letter.

10 So the -- the questions that have been
11 coming up around this subject are the -- we've come to
12 understand that the Trust has -- correct me if I'm wrong,
13 but submitted a request for a report or something, a
14 document around PAHs out on the coastal sites and
15 requesting that that be re-evaluated.

16 Is that a --

17 MS. FANELLI: The letter I copied the
18 entire RAB on was the one with the overall factor. It
19 wasn't specifically related to any site.

20 It was -- I think it did have a site name
21 was how Mactec was charging in their footer, but the body
22 of the letter was not site specific.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. It seemed like
24 it was coming up due to the Baker beach, maybe the
25 Merchant Road sites.

1 Am I correct about that?

2 MS. FANELLI: The original discussion of
3 PAH and background centered around conversations between
4 the Army, the Park Service, the Trust and DTSC on
5 Merchant Road.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. So my -- my
7 question is in this request, how is that process moving
8 along, and I might have a variety of questions, but is
9 there -- have you done any -- we just don't know
10 anything.

11 MS. TSUJI: We are proceeding, because the
12 resources are just not always -- not on the bottom of the
13 list, but it's not on the top of the list to be reviewed.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

15 MS. TSUJI: That's -- I don't know how
16 else to put it.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: That's perfect.

18 MS. TSUJI: It's in the middle of the
19 pack. We've got a lot of work coming to us, and the
20 Department is losing staff to retirements. Medi has
21 Treasure Island and we're losing our toxicologist there,
22 so that's just one more toxicologist.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh.

24 MS. TSUJI: So our tox staff. It is Kimi.
25 I think you've met her before. She's done human health,

1 but she is part-time. She is not full-time after her
2 retirement.

3 She has come back to the Department as a
4 retired person, and because of her knowledge on the site,
5 they have her continuing her role as a toxicologist
6 rather than having a new person starting from square one.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: That's a big advantage.

8 MS. TSUJI: But she's had a couple other
9 major projects that have required her attention.

10 MS. SUNGA: She does get involved on PAH
11 studies.

12 MS. TSUJI: Yes. She may be involved.
13 The Department did do a Northern California/Southern
14 California study.

15 So she is the technical go-to person within
16 the toxicology for the PAHs. That's another reason why I
17 said that.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, our -- our
19 experiences so far has been just witnessing some
20 discussion between the Park Service and the Trust here at
21 our meetings, and this letter -- and we really just
22 wanted to communicate with you to see where we might
23 interact in the process.

24 And so we understand it's -- it's in a
25 certain parts of the queue and there it is, and so we'll

1 just reserve our questions until it comes to a certain
2 time to work on that with you.

3 MS. TSUJI: I'll let her know that you are
4 interested in it.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Perfect. Thank you.
6 John.

7 MR. BUDROE: I just got a general
8 viewpoint on that. If we're going to start opening up
9 the PRG table, the DTSC ought to think about opening it
10 up globally.

11 There are a number of values that are
12 outdated. The residential PRG value for lead in the
13 cleanup document is 400 milligrams per kilogram of soil.

14 Well, the latest chisel, one of Kimi Power
15 points is 80. So you're talking about five-fold
16 reduction in cleanup levels, and that's something -- that
17 is just an example.

18 There's a lot of areas where new science
19 has come along and there are levels that have been
20 substantially reduced.

21 So if the document's going to be opened, it
22 ought to be opened globally, not just for PAHs.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, it's an
24 interesting point. Yes.

25 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: What's DTSC?

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Department of Toxic
2 Substances Control, and we happen to have two
3 representatives from the Department here. It's our state
4 regulatory agency that receives the documents from the
5 Presidio Trust and makes decisions around whether they
6 approve of various remedies.

7 So, yeah, back to your point, John, the --
8 sort of a global -- some might go up, some might be more
9 relaxed, but some might become more restrictive.

10 MR. BUDROE: (Nods head affirmatively).

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we'll keep our --
12 we'll hold on to our questions until it becomes right.

13 MS. BLUM: John brings up an interesting
14 point to me and I'd like to ask this. Excuse me for the
15 zinger, but can you change the acceptable level for one
16 entity and not change it for every entity?

17 I mean, could you --

18 MS. TSUJI: The way the Department
19 approaches it is once we have approved a cleanup level
20 for a site.

21 MS. BLUM: For a site.

22 MS. TSUJI: For a site, whether it's this
23 site, Southern California, Northern California, a site
24 and there is -- over time, there have been changes to
25 cleanup level.

1 MS. BLUM: With the Presidio or in
2 general?

3 MS. TSUJI: My statements are just in
4 general. We do not go back and reopen every single site
5 that we've made a decision on if there is a number
6 change.

7 That would basically -- if you want to have
8 a long line of work ahead of us, then, you know, using
9 lead, we would have to go back to every single site that
10 we've overseen cleanups on and reopen the whole process
11 all over.

12 We do not do that.

13 However, for sites that have not been
14 remediated to an unrestricted land use at the time that
15 decision was made, they're under what we call operation
16 and maintenance, and every five years, they have to re-
17 evaluate is the cleanup as remediated still effective,
18 which includes the reconsider -- if they're using
19 technology out there that could go back in and remediate
20 the site, make it better, is there new science that
21 causes the risk analysis, the risk assessment to be
22 re-evaluated?

23 And it's usually done during the five-year
24 review period, but that's only for sites that have had
25 contamination remaining on the site and they're under a

1 land use restriction and operation and maintenance.

2 MS. KRAMER: So then if further cleanup
3 was required, is the Trust responsible for that or where
4 does that money come from to do that?

5 MS. TSUJI: Well, I can't answer the
6 question of where the money comes from, but the
7 Department would go back to the responsible parties.

8 MS. KRAMER: And recommend --

9 MS. TSUJI: And ask that -- if the
10 evaluation of the five-year review, and that's just not
11 the first five-year review.

12 As long as there is a land use restriction
13 and operation and maintenance every five years until they
14 decide to go back and move it, move it all to an
15 unrestricted land use level, every five years, a land use
16 evaluation occurs.

17 I have a long answer for that.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: John.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Can I ask a Mountain Lake
20 question, then?

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Following the discussion we
23 just had, we know we're going to leave contamination in
24 place, so does that mean that every five years, we're
25 going to re-evaluate the cleanup level and consider

1 cleaning up Mountain Lake again?

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, we did have this
3 happen in our history here at the Presidio with landfill
4 10 and landfill 8, as I recall.

5 There were issues that were brought up in
6 the five-year review that suggested that the remediation
7 that the Army had in place wasn't protective.

8 So it's possible, for example, the
9 remediation is done in Mountain Lake, the road is
10 protected, something is done along the road, but maybe
11 it's not effective and something happens. Maybe there's
12 plant life along that side of the road or something shows
13 obvious signs of distress or something.

14 Someone points it out and there's more
15 sampling done and it's shown that there's a problem.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: But there's no way to
17 restrict access to Mountain Lake since it's a lake and
18 mostly it's -- we're protecting the wildlife; right? Not
19 people.

20 MS. FANELLI: There's the presumption that
21 there's been a decision that waste is lead.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm sorry. She said if
23 there was waste, we're not taking Park Presidio, so I was
24 just following the discussion here trying to put dots
25 together.

1 MS. FANELLI: I don't think that we've
2 completed our analysis that says that it will be. I
3 think that's just an example.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's possible because you're
6 undermining the highway. Then you have to make a risk
7 management decision.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Right. So that's why I was
9 just asking, okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: I would imagine in that
11 case, if there was a human health risk left in that area,
12 then there would be a land use control.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: And then that would be
15 reviewed in the five-year review and it would be
16 evaluated --

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: -- as to whether the
19 land use control was still effective.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm just trying to figure
21 out the context here.

22 MS. TSUJI: To kind of take your idea
23 and -- if -- as an example, if there is a -- let's say on
24 the non-water slope there is contamination, we would not
25 just allow that contamination just to stay as is. There

would need to be a protective barrier basically from
above surface.

1 So whether it's -- it's an engineered
2 covering that goes over there so that people can't go and
3 dig, those would be a part of the initial remediation,
4 and then the operation and maintenance would require
5 maintenance of that engineered cover.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Right. Just like E.

7 MS. TSUJI: Right.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. I understand.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: One other question, but
10 I guess comes up about Mountain Lake. There was some
11 discussion at the last meeting around the different
12 options for excavation might impact some of the
13 vegetation that's there simply because you've got to get
14 down to the lake, things of that nature.

15 Is there more thinking or detail that will
16 be presented on that -- do you know -- at the meeting?

17 MS. FANELLI: I think we'll be able to
18 present our -- the various dredging alternatives and our
19 approaches and laydown areas.

20 That is what we're preparing, and then to
21 look at what that means in terms of traffic and
22 operations, concerns that may affect the public and the
23 public's experiences while that remediation is ongoing.

24 Obviously we're going to design this so we
25 have the minimal impact to the existing vegetation around

1 the lake, particularly those portions that have been
2 already restored with native plants.

3 So our first approach is avoidance.

4 FACILITATOR KERN: Of course, yeah.

5 Very good. Well, are there any other
6 questions on the PAHs or the Mountain Lake? Yes.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Just for the sake of
8 spreading the word to people in the neighborhood --
9 because I live in a neighborhood near there -- do you
10 picture the meeting will just be telling people what the
11 options are, but not really showing what option is being
12 headed toward or could I tell people that it will be
13 presenting what -- what the likely procedure is going to
14 be or not?

15 MS. TSUJI: That's really a question --
16 it's really a Trust question. The Department will not
17 make a decision as to what the cleanup will entail until
18 such time there is a RAP, Remedial Action Plan that goes
19 out for a public review and comment.

20 So it's premature for the Department to say
21 which is going to be the selected one. The Trust is --
22 in order to plan -- move toward getting to a cleanup,
23 they do need to start looking at the various options and
24 what it means as far as the roadway.

25 So there's a lot of preliminary work that

1 the Trust is doing, but for the Department, it is through
2 the Remedial Action Plan where the Department will make a
3 decision.

4 MS. CHEEVER: Then maybe I should ask
5 Eileen.

6 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Do you picture it getting
8 community input how to select a different option?

9 MS. FANELLI: Well, we plan to -- what we
10 plan to preview is what the remediation looks like from
11 our perspective and how far it will play out over time
12 and what the impacts will be.

13 So certainly we're looking at the
14 various -- and this was presented at the last meeting,
15 some of the various dredging options.

16 So clearly we're looking at removal of the
17 sediments and the various dredging options and how that
18 might impact vegetation, whether that means truck traffic
19 in the area that we're proposing to use for a laydown
20 area, how we're going to get our equipment in and out.

21 Some of that's already been previewed, and
22 what I see will take that a little bit further and add
23 the element of our conversations with Caltrans, because
24 we're at that point where we feel -- and they're
25 comfortable with coming and participating in terms of how

1 we're going to coordinate activities on that common
2 boundary, the Highway 1 boundary and the Mountain Lake
3 boundary.

4 So I -- this is about in many ways
5 transparency and disclosure of what we're thinking about
6 and how we're trying to achieve construction for
7 construction in 2013.

8 MS. SUNGA: We understand you're going to
9 present your preferred alternative from the Trust?

10 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We have our idea of
11 what kind of removal is protective of the ecological
12 environment.

13 So yes, we'll be taking a look at that
14 based on the RI.

15 MS. BLUM: When you talk to Caltrans, does
16 the issue of an inadvertent oil spill from a tanker using
17 Highway 1 to transfer the product, does that ever enter
18 into the discussions how do we protect the lake from a
19 future event which may or may not happen?

20 MS. FANELLI: Right. That was one of the
21 subjects of the lawsuit. So when the consent decree
22 comes out, there have been numerous discussions with
23 Caltrans about modifying their storm drainage structures
24 so that that discharge does not go directly, as it does
25 today, to Mountain Lake.

1 MS. BLUM: Where would it go? If that
2 happened, would they have --

3 MS. FANELLI: If it happened today, it
4 would go into Mountain Lake.

5 MS. BLUM: I mean --

6 MS. FANELLI: That's the issue. We don't
7 know where -- we don't know what the final resolution is,
8 but that's one of the pieces that Caltrans is committed
9 to working on into the future to resolve.

10 MS. BLUM: Okay.

11 MS. FANELLI: That is a separate project,
12 though -- I want to stress -- from remediation, and it's
13 on its own time track.

14 MS. BLUM: Yeah.

15 MS. FANELLI: And so we're not going to
16 get into detail about that long-term plan, but we have
17 asked Caltrans about interim measures to make sure that
18 there's something that is doing a little bit more than
19 what exists today, some interim BMP to make sure storm
20 runoff from the highway is passively treated at least
21 before it discharges into the lake, while they're working
22 on that long-term solution for the highway runoff.

23 MS. CHEEVER: I have a question. Is the
24 RI a public document? Because when we get it, we have to
25 use the password.

1 MS. FANELLI: The RI is public because --
2 I'm sure.

3 MS. TSUJI: It's public in the context
4 that it's -- the Department has it, and if someone were
5 to request to see a copy, we would provide it.

6 MS. CHEEVER: Suppose we knew people, just
7 maybe interested citizens, is it all right to make -- for
8 us to make it available to them?

9 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Mark.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: Where do we look for the
13 consent decree?

14 MS. FANELLI: It's not published it.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Where do we look?

16 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure. I believe it
17 has to be posted -- I'm not sure what the federal
18 judiciary is, but it gets posted for a thirty-day public
19 comment period, and I can find out.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Just one other question
21 about Caltrans. I guess thinking about it now, I would
22 not have anticipated that they would have been at this
23 meeting for some reason, and since I've always put their
24 role in terms of repairing this flow into Mountain Lake
25 and things of that nature, what -- can you generally

1 describe what their role is going to be at this meeting?
2 What will they be talking to us about?

3 MS. FANELLI: We're going to be talking
4 specifically about how we operate at that margin to
5 maintain highway stability.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

7 MS. FANELLI: And how we interim protect
8 water quality so we don't get sediments that may have
9 lead being discharged into Mountain Lake in that interim
10 period while we're waiting for Caltrans to work through
11 the longer term diversion project, is how we refer to it.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

13 MS. FANELLI: Storm water from Highway 1.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: I see. Thank you.

15 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else?

17 Thank you very much for being here tonight.

18 Did you have any of your own comments? We
19 normally have a section for our regulators. We haven't
20 seen you in a while, so we appreciate that you're here.
21 I don't want to overlook that we have had that as a
22 normal agenda item.

23 Is there anything you'd like to report?

24 MS. SUNGA: Everybody knows that we're --
25 we just received the final -- the advise RI report for

1 Mountain Lake. We're looking at that document and in the
2 process of hopefully approving it or -- I think there's
3 more information that the Trust is looking at on the
4 beach area. They'll be doing some sampling on the beach
5 area.

6 FACILITATOR KERN: I see.

7 MS. SUNGA: Defining the boundary of the
8 sediment report.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: Excellent.

10 All right. Item number 6, we normally go
11 by this fairly quickly, but we have two members of the
12 public here. Welcome, and if you care to make a comment
13 at all, we're certainly so pleased that you're here, and
14 here's your opportunity to make any comment of any kind.

15 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Okay. Great. We're
16 actually spies from SF State.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Perfect.

18 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Full disclosure.

19 We're concentrating on the main post and
20 the future of the main post as the Trust becomes self-
21 sufficient and no longer receives federal funding.

22 We're trying to pick it apart and do a -- I
23 guess a zoning kind of land use perspective of the entire
24 area as a concentration, geography and planning, policies
25 and what not.

1 I could go off for another hour and a half.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: I would have to cut you
3 off after a few minutes.

4 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Yeah. I know.
5 That's what happens.

6 We toured the officer's quarters on
7 Saturday and noted that the chapel foundation wall was
8 highlighted with new stone and actually continuation of
9 the wall was out into Moraga Drive.

10 I'm wondering how much more excavation is
11 there planned in the future for the kind of sea of
12 asphalt parking lot which seems kind of ludicrous with
13 today's parking concerns for the Presidio is going to be
14 removed or put back to a natural state or an open space
15 to encourage more public activity and what not.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I just want to
17 give you thirty seconds about a background of what this
18 meeting is.

19 We've been meeting actually as a
20 Restoration Advisory Board dealing with contamination
21 issues of the Presidio since 1994, and in that long a
22 process, there have been many sites that have been
23 cleaned up beginning with Crissy Field and then many of
24 the landfills.

25 But we've always kept very separate other

1 issues at the Presidio, the main post. In fact, there
2 really hasn't been a significant amount of contamination
3 issues there.

4 There have been buildings around the main
5 post and other areas that might have had lead
6 contamination in the soil from building flake -- the
7 paint.

8 There might have been storage tanks in the
9 basements. Much of that work is -- the storage tank work
10 was completed long ago and there's ongoing lead-based
11 paint cleanups that have been going on for years and
12 continue.

13 But we have really never -- this has never
14 really been a forum for the the issue, -- I think the
15 issues that you were speaking to --

16 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: The very person on
17 our team, all three of us have a different part with the
18 main post, and the third person is remediation, and
19 unfortunately she can't be here. It's her subject.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

21 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: But it's not a
22 remediation issue, the main post.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: It's really not. There
24 may be issues inside of buildings if there was asbestos
25 or lead-based paint inside, but we deal with releases to

1 the environment, so we've never really dealt with
2 interior of buildings here at this meeting.

3 So I just want to make sure you knew --

4 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Sure.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: -- so you could make
6 sure you got to the right place, and you're obviously
7 well --

8 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: We know that the
9 main post --

10 MS. CHEEVER: Fillsite 6 is too far from
11 the main post.

12 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, that would
13 certainly be, you know, adjacent to the main post, but
14 I'm just -- I may have made the wrong assumption.

15 I was thinking you were just thinking about
16 the building and around the main post, but you're
17 obviously welcome to attend any of our meetings, and we'd
18 be happy to provide any information we can for your
19 needs.

20 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

21 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: A big part of our
22 project is looking at different agencies involved for our
23 class.

24 The Presidio is an interesting anomaly in
25 San Francisco because it's not subject to the same zoning

1 laws that the rest of the city proper is.

2 So coming here and speaking to all of you
3 is another look at the different boards and entities that
4 meet.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

6 MS. BLUM: I'm sure you've had an
7 opportunity to investigate the Presidio Trust website.

8 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: Oh, yeah.

9 MS. BLUM: The main post, that would be a
10 document that you would be most interested in for the
11 future.

12 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: The ROD that was put
13 on the post?

14 MS. BLUM: Yes. It was done last year.
15 Last year, I think.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: There are a lot of
17 work.

18 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: There's a great lot
19 of information.

20 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT 2: It's so cool.
21 Yeah, this thing.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, you're absolutely
23 welcome to come to meetings. I didn't in any way want to
24 suggest otherwise. I just want to make sure --

25 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I understand the

1 focus here.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Action
3 items. We have our -- our letter that's available for
4 DTSC and the the PAH issue and we can have discussions
5 whether that becomes a pressing item.

6 We're going to submit -- maybe we could
7 collect our Mountain Lake questions in one place and then
8 send them in one shot over to Medi and Genevieve.

9 That's what I would recommend from us, but
10 I would also recommend getting the word out to other
11 organizations to get their questions in in advance.

12 Let's see. We had -- there's the meeting
13 tomorrow at the building 228 site. You're obviously
14 welcome to come to that, and at a future meeting, we'll
15 be having the quarterly report discussion.

16 MS. FANELLI: I think it's normally the
17 next meeting.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. December. Okay.
19 Anything else for the good of the order?

20 MS. MONAGHAN: We said we were going to do
21 an update on landfill 2 and fillsite 1 next month, too.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

23 MS. FANELLI: I'll do it as part of the
24 quarterly report.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, okay. That's fine.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Unless it's been brought up,
2 next meeting is the closest meeting we have to the
3 holidays. Surprising how fast time goes.

4 If we just wanted to bring a few
5 refreshments, sort of pot luck, is there any constraint
6 on our doing it?

7 I remember one meeting, we could just bring
8 cookies.

9 MS. FANELLI: You can bring whatever you
10 like. The issue was alcohol in a federal building
11 without a permit. That's the issue.

12 MS. CHEEVER: So we can bring anything?
13 Well, I hereby -- I remember your brownies. Didn't you
14 bring -- all right. Anyhow, I hereby invite all fellow
15 people to bring things, if they want to, just -- we'll
16 have a regular meeting?

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

18 MS. CHEEVER. We certainly encourage Denise
19 to bring her famous brownies.

20 MS. FANELLI: Your popcorn's pretty good,
21 too. Your caramel popcorn.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I'd like to thank our
23 public members for coming tonight, the Department
24 members. Thank you very much. Thank you to the Trust
25 for coming out.

1 MS. FANELLI: You're welcome.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: We never thank Mark
3 enough. We appreciate his work.

4 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

5 (The meeting concluded at 9:05 PM).

6 ---o0o---

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the time
5 and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a full, true and
6 complete record of said matter.

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for
8 either or any of the parties in the foregoing meeting and caption
9 named, or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in
10 said action.

11

12

13

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have

14

hereunto set my hand this

15

7th day of February,

16

2012.

17

18


MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2012

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

ATTENDEES

RAB Members:

Doug Kern, Facilitator

Mark Youngkin

Eileen Fanelli

Terri Thomas

Andrea Andersen

Denise Tsuji

Radhika Majhail

Julie Cheever

Sam Berman

Jan Monaghan

Gloria Gee

John Budroe

John Chester

Sara Segal

Julie Cheever

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

of the Meeting, and on December 13, 2011, 7:07 PM at the

Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,

before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of

California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the

provisions of the Presidio Trust.

---o0o---

AGENDA

Page

1		
2		
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Doug Kern:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements - None	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. Quarterly Report - Eileen Fanelli, Trust	4
8	B. Mountain Lake Update	42
9	5) New Business	
10	A. PAH Letter	77
11	6) Public Comment - None	
12	7) Action Items and Agenda Items	80
13	8) Closing	86

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Welcome, everyone, to
2 the final meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory
3 Board for 2011? We add that in. Happy Holidays to
4 everybody that's attending tonight. Thanks for coming
5 out.

6 Welcome to the Presidio Trust, several
7 members here tonight. There's -- Bob is coming in. We
8 were just talking about him, DTSC. Thank you for being
9 here.

10 I understand from Brian that he is sick.
11 He's not doing well, so there's a bit of things going
12 around. It's been cold. And welcome to all of the
13 community RAB members. Thanks for coming out tonight.

14 Does everyone have an agenda? Are there
15 any changes or additions? Any announcements?

16 Moving right along to item 4, the quarterly
17 report.

18 MS. FANELLI: Okay. Everybody got the
19 quarterly report probably about a month ago on the
20 Internet e-mail. All right. So I'll cover the
21 milestones, cost to date, schedule performance, a little
22 bit about our program review, quarterly activities and
23 then we're going to talk about the Mountain Lake consent
24 decree with Caltrans, and Andrea will take care of that
25 portion of it.

1 Milestones. You know, we've been moving
2 very, very quickly as you're all very much aware, and if
3 you've walked up Tennessee Hollow, you can see the work
4 that we've been doing, but we basically in the last
5 quarter substantially completed the covering of landfill
6 E. So that work is basically done.

7 We also completed fillsite 1, landfill 2
8 final grading, and since then, we have initiated and
9 basically completed the planting of those two sites, as
10 well.

11 937, we initiated construction a little bit
12 after September. We had planned to actually start the
13 work in September, but it was delayed till October for
14 various reasons, but that work as of today, they poured
15 the final slab and it's pretty much complete, too.

16 We submitted the Remedial Investigation
17 report to DTSC for the Baker Beach 1A site, and I think
18 you all got notice of that and there's a copy at the
19 Presidio Trust.

20 If you're interested, as well, you can get
21 that off of Envirostore.

22 And we also submitted the RI for Mountain
23 Lake, and that was the work done for Mountain Lake and it
24 included a risk assessment with it.

25 Under the petroleum program, our milestones

1 where we turned on in August the system for in-situ
2 treatment of the Stoddard solvent by the historical
3 building wall in building 228.

4 I'm happy to report the system looks like
5 it's we're going to be shutting it off in the next
6 several weeks, but we can talk about that later, and the
7 lead-based paint, we're continuing to make progress,
8 submitted several closure requests and have gotten
9 closures on many of the buildings. So in a nutshell.

10 Cost-wise, we've increased our current
11 budget estimates to 165 million dollars. Last quarter,
12 it was about 163. The driver solely on this is landfill
13 E, and I can tell you the reasons for that, but you can
14 see that we have spent to date 120 million dollars on the
15 remediation program, and we're looking to spend another
16 45 before we're done.

17 The projects with the greatest activity, no
18 surprise again. Fillsite 1, landfill 2 where we were
19 doing our final grading. Landfill E where we were really
20 spending money because the contractor was moving very
21 quickly to get the cover in place.

22 Lead-based paint has kicked in. We spent
23 significant amounts in Fort Scott in several of the
24 larger buildings in Fort Scott and got lead-based paint
25 taken care of there.

1 207/231, again no surprise because we are
2 doing the active in-situ treatment, and DTSC oversight.
3 That's a fairly large amount. That represented two of
4 their building periods in one invoice.

5 And the last sort of financial picture and
6 then I can answer any questions specifically about sites.

7 Our current estimate has ticked up a little
8 bit. I can tell you that we are now looking at our
9 estimates to complete on a monthly basis and evaluating
10 our costs.

11 Some projects, some sites have upward
12 pressures. Other sites have downward pressures.
13 Fortunately, I tend to have more upward pressure than
14 downward pressure, but we're looking at it on a monthly
15 basis.

16 We're looking above a hundred million, plus
17 the offsites that we have in place that we're looking for
18 coverage under either the RSL or the remedial policy, and
19 that's basically the finance pieces of it.

20 Now, I have some photographs of where we
21 are on the sites, but I'm happy to answer any questions
22 on finances.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Could we go back --

24 MS. FANELLI: Certainly.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: -- on that one?

1 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: I'm noticing on the
3 207/231, I think you were saying that you're almost done
4 with getting ready to -- or that's the 228.

5 Is that --

6 MS. FANELLI: It's just the 228 RI,
7 basically. The next big piece we have at 207/231 is the
8 excavation between former building 231 and building 230,
9 which is, I believe, scheduled for demolition in the
10 short-term.

11 We're hoping that it's demolished before we
12 begin our work. If it's not, we're going to do our work,
13 anyway, and we're trying to do that mass excavation in
14 the spring time frame.

15 News on that site. We have procured a
16 source of sand to backfill that excavation. That source
17 is a large excavation on the corner of Market and Tenth
18 where they're digging down thirty feet for a garage.

19 We've sampled the site. Can somebody grab
20 the door? We have another guest.

21 And it's beautiful dune sands. Old dune
22 sand that's been buried. No excess weed seed. Hasn't
23 seen the light of day for a hundred years.

24 We're getting prepared to import that sand
25 and we're going to be storing that at the 1063 site, and

1 its future designated use is going to be at the 207/231
2 site.

3 And other sites as we need. So we're
4 bringing in a little bit of extra, and I think natural
5 resources is already looking at getting some of that sand
6 for some other projects.

7 MS. SEGAL: Can I ask a question? When
8 you acquire sand like that, it's a win-win situation for
9 the guys building the garage and you guys, do you have to
10 pay for that sand? How does that work?

11 MS. FANELLI: We are going to pay a minor
12 amount for it, but it's nothing. In essence, we're
13 looking at a cost to us about \$50 a truck, which is
14 nominal.

15 MS. SEGAL: You don't have to fill your
16 own trucks or you rent them?

17 MS. FANELLI: No, no. The contractor
18 doing the excavation will do that and they'll charge us
19 \$50 a truck.

20 We've paid up to \$50 a yard a ton before,
21 so \$50 a truck, it's a bargain.

22 MS. SEGAL: Okay.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: On the landfill E
24 budget, does that reflect the increase that you were
25 talking about?

1 MS. FANELLI: The landfill E budget went
2 up about 1.9 million. The major driver for the landfill
3 E increase, when we did our original costing, we were
4 importing 10,000 to 12,000 yards of material from the
5 East Bay MUD Miller Road site and we were hoping to make
6 up the difference in what we needed, which was more like
7 20,000 yards from excavations for Doyle Drive.

8 Well, the Doyle Drive excavations never
9 came about, so we didn't have that material. So we ended
10 up processing an additional six, 7,000 yards of material
11 from the East Bay MUD site.

12 So that accounts for the majority of the
13 cost increase, actually. It's about 600 plus thousand
14 dollars in just excess cost for bringing in dirt.

15 The other excess cost -- and I think that
16 we've overestimated it at this point in terms of the
17 budget -- is that we had about a thousand yards excess
18 waste material.

19 When we did our final grading and cutting
20 to get everything in place and liners in place, we had
21 about a thousand yards of landfill material that had to
22 be disposed of offsite, and that was not in our original
23 estimate.

24 We have contingencies, but we hadn't plan
25 on having to provide power.

1 It's stockpiled now in the dust bowl, so if
2 you drive by the dust bowl and you see all the piles of
3 dirt under plastic, you'll see it under bright orange
4 covering.

5 Fortunately, we've just gotten the
6 characterization of those stockpiles and we are not
7 hazardous waste for lead or any other parameters.

8 So we're able to dispose of it at a class 2
9 facility, and it should be going offsite Thursday and
10 Friday of this week out of the dust bowl.

11 So those are the two drivers. We also
12 updated our long-term monitoring estimates and we moved
13 things around, but the construction was a little bit more
14 than we thought it was going to be based on the
15 engineer's estimate.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: And this is the new
17 budget, then?

18 MS. FANELLI: This is the new budget. So
19 that budget includes our future cost. So we haven't
20 spent that much money. That includes our monitoring
21 costs into the future.

22 Planting costs for next year and those
23 types of things.

24 I don't think we've changed the budget for
25 fillsite 1 or landfill 2. Those are going to come in

1 pretty much on our original budget.

2 MS. SEGAL: Did you say the total budget
3 is 165, not 145? Total, not those?

4 MS. FANELLI: Oh, it is 165 million.

5 MS. SEGAL: Okay.

6 MS. FANELLI: 913,000. Now that includes
7 unknowns, and our unknown estimates are -- have a very
8 high degree of uncertainty in them.

9 So it's hard to -- you know, I would say
10 there's a good four or five million dollars of push in
11 this budget just because of the unknowns, and we do still
12 carry contingencies on many sites.

13 MR. BERMAN: In the 207/231 budget, is
14 there -- is there going to be continual monitoring
15 involved?

16 MS. FANELLI: There's going to be
17 monitoring per the cap until we've satisfied Regional
18 Water Quality Control Board that we don't have
19 groundwater impacts.

20 I believe in the estimate, that's a three-
21 or five-year cost that we're currently carrying in the
22 budget.

23 To that point, we just also -- these are
24 minor things -- I don't actually talk about -- but we did
25 install and they've been monitored now for one quarter

1 in -- or they will be monitored for the first time in
2 December this month two of the downgradient wells at 207/
3 231.

4 So they were installed on the north side of
5 Mason Street, technically in area A, and they're our
6 first two downgradient wells, and we fast-tracked them
7 even though we haven't finished all the remediation,
8 because per our insurance policy deadline, we wanted to
9 make sure that -- we tried to get as much data as we
10 possibly could before that magic 2014 date to work with.

11 And so even though it's not the full suite
12 necessarily of downgradient monitoring wells, we've got
13 at least two wells downgradient that will provide us with
14 some good information over the next couple of years.

15 MR. BERMAN: What are the COCs in the
16 excavation there?

17 MS. FANELLI: At 207/231. It's primarily
18 the petroleum products. It's a Water Board site.

19 There were some metals above our screening
20 levels in the cleanup level document, arsenic, some of
21 the selenium. From might -- even there is some lead that
22 was associated with the leaded fuels, and our hope is
23 that when we excavate, we're going to try to get
24 obviously all of the petroleum out and the bulk of any of
25 the metals that are in excess or are a result of the use

1 of petroleum products at the site.

2 MR. BERMAN: So the volume of excavation
3 has already been estimated with the borings and so on?

4 MS. FANELLI: It has. I think we're
5 fairly confident in the cost for 207/231. The cap for
6 207/231 was actually submitted to Water Board my first
7 year here, which was 2008, and has been sitting with the
8 Water Board since then, and the approach that we've taken
9 is to do it in phases.

10 So if you remember about a year ago, we did
11 207 excavation, and I believe it was the 208 RU was a
12 little sump that was nearby.

13 Now we're doing the wall interface with
14 228, and our next big excavation is the one between 230
15 and 231.

16 And we have a very large excavation there
17 if you look at the 2008 corrective action plan. I'm
18 hoping that we don't have to excavate that much material,
19 because it is quite a large hole, but we'll see what we
20 have to do once we get in there.

21 MR. BERMAN: But in your budget, you
22 assume that it could be that large amount?

23 MS. FANELLI: Yes, we have. Yes, we have.

24 We also upped it. That was upped last
25 time, last quarter, and I don't know if you were at the

1 last quarterly meeting, but I reported that that budget
2 had increased, and the driver for that increase was our
3 changing the designation or waste classification of our
4 excess material.

5 When we did some of the soil borings for
6 the in-situ work, the soils that were spoils tested out
7 as Cal haz, whereas the RCRA where we hadn't anticipated
8 that.

9 So we changed our cost estimate actually to
10 include a higher percentage or higher classification of
11 waste having to go offsite for disposal based on that
12 experience.

13 Time for the pictures. So actually what I
14 did here, I kind of took this from a presentation we did
15 for the Trust Executive Management Team.

16 I have a couple of pictures that Rick
17 Miller -- if you remember Rick from my staff -- had done
18 earlier. He had taped them together before and after.

19 This is sort of -- if you can even imagine
20 it, this is what fillsite 1 looked like before with Paul
21 Goode Field, and we had this big flat parking area that
22 was fillsite 1.

23 And here it is kind of looking over at
24 landfill 2. Here's Julius Kahn, tennis courts up here,
25 the big flat parking area that kind of went down into

1 dune sand.

2 It was difficult to walk, full of all those
3 trees that took you around towards Inspiration Point.

4 Of course we removed about 450 trees when
5 we did our work, and this is what it looked like. It's
6 not actually as it looks today, but this was towards the
7 end of September when we basically finished everything at
8 the site, and all those trees are gone and the parking
9 lot, flat area is gone, fillsite 1, landfill 2.

10 These two drainage pipes are not visible
11 anymore because they're covered with fabric. Here is our
12 drainage swale that's going to take primarily
13 concentrated soil that does not come off of Julius Kahn
14 down to Polin Springs. That's what the public saw at the
15 end of September.

16 A few more pictures, a little bit close-up.
17 You can see here the seeding that we placed, which is a
18 mixture of native brasses that Terri can certainly talk
19 more about, mixed with a sterile wheat grass that was
20 applied to the different slopes; not to the serpentine
21 bedrock, but to the historic forest area and to the other
22 native landscape plant areas.

23 You can see that we've mulched and
24 reestablished the trails that go along the site, and
25 there were actual difference in serpentine area.

1 You can see there are no grasses here.

2 Actually, I didn't realize this, so Terri, you might talk
3 about the test plots, because you can see them.

4 MS. THOMAS: Now? Mention it now?

5 MS. FANELLI: Now would be fine.

6 MS. THOMAS: All right.

7 MS. FANELLI: I'll just do the rest of the
8 pictures.

9 Just another view of the trail. We've
10 reestablished railing on this particular steep side of
11 the slope as you're coming around Inspiration Point.

12 This is over by fillsite 1. The Trust is
13 under separate contract, not remediation. We've
14 transplanted about seven larger oaks into that area to be
15 a buffer between the future parking area and El Polin on
16 the top of that slope.

17 Here's fillsite 1, landfill 2. This is
18 before we planted trees. You can see the historic
19 incinerator. That's been reestablished up there on the
20 slope.

21 This might be a good time. You can see a
22 little plot clearly lined out, but maybe talk about what
23 you're doing in the serpentine area.

24 MS. THOMAS: Sure. I don't know if you
25 all remember, but we redesignated some historic forest

1 that was actually right down from the endangered habitat
2 to serpentine grassland, and that had been accounted for
3 in some -- endangered species biological work that we had
4 done, and so we were to restore that to clarkia.

5 And once we had the serpentine in place --
6 and a lot of it wasn't the native serpentine for
7 Inspiration Point, but some of it came from Doyle Drive,
8 it tested with a very high pH, so Fish and Wildlife
9 Service suggested we get a couple of serpentine
10 specialists in.

11 They came in and checked the soil and
12 recommended a few experimental plots to see if it was
13 fine just the way it was or if it might help with some
14 amendment.

15 Generally you don't want to amend for this
16 kind of -- for this kind of soil. So we wanted to do it
17 on a very minor basis.

18 So they had recommended some people to work
19 with at Creekside, which we're working with, and the
20 experiment is designed and we'll see what happens.

21 We're not planting any clarkia this year.
22 We're going to see how the native grasses that are right
23 from -- from Inspiration Point do. We have the exact
24 genetic species at Inspiration Point and we're trying to
25 out plant the native forms and grasses in year. A

1 lot of plants are going to go in, and we'll see how they
2 do and how the whole site does before introducing
3 clarkia.

4 MR. BOGGS: Did you find a localized area
5 with the high pH or other serpentine throughout the
6 Presidio fairly high pH, as well? Or did you just find
7 Inspiration Point right there?

8 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. We've tested the
9 serpentine throughout the Presidio, and a lot of it's
10 pretty high. This was just higher than across the way.

11 So we were a little worried about the
12 species that were just across the way.

13 Some of the experts that we had worked on
14 serpentines on like a pH of 13 and said we'd still do
15 fine. This was like at 10 at the highest and the
16 serpentine was like 8.

17 MR. BOGGS: 13's really high.

18 MS. THOMAS: Those were very disturbed
19 mining type soils that he had worked with, but he worked
20 with a lot of areas and he'd written several chapters on
21 books on restoration of serpentine habitat.

22 MS. FANELLI: I could add that the
23 serpentine that was used to reconstruct the slope came
24 from the Doyle Drive excavations. So it was definitely a
25 subsoil.

1 As part of the remediation project, because
2 we replanted about 17,000 plugs of native grasses just in
3 the serpentine slope area, and that's all been completed.

4 H.T. Harvey & Associates did an analysis
5 working in conjunction with Mark Frey and Terri where
6 they looked at the quality of the subsoil that had come
7 off of -- from Doyle Drive and they compared it to a
8 couple of reference sites, one of them being the slope
9 above.

10 So we did actually do significant testing
11 of the pH. It wasn't a localized area. It's really a
12 characteristic of this serpentine that came from -- from
13 Doyle Drive, and apparently based on the experts, it's
14 not significantly out of line with what you might expect
15 from the serpentine type soil.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: When's the nature of
17 the test plots, then? What's being done there?

18 MS. THOMAS: You know, it's changed a
19 little bit. So I'm being a little bit tentative here.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

21 MS. THOMAS: And Eileen might know an
22 update, but I really need to get you an update from Lew,
23 because they haven't planted them yet. They're putting
24 them in Thursday and Friday.

25 Stu Wise from Creekside is kind of leading

1 that charge, and at first they were going to do some
2 fertilizing, but they took that off the plot, took that
3 offline, and I believe the most exciting one for me is I
4 think they're making almost like a compost out of the
5 soil across the road at Inspiration Point.

6 So that we would be inoculating the species
7 with the same micro flora and fauna that's right across
8 the road. So that's kind of the most exciting one from
9 my standpoint.

10 But I think that there's another compost
11 one, as well, that's going to be initiated and then just
12 the way it is. I think there's two different treatments.

13 But I can get you that information exactly
14 tomorrow. I just didn't -- it wasn't up-to-date.

15 MS. FANELLI: And just to sort of clarify,
16 the difference between these test plots, and I believe
17 you have twelve, and they're ten by ten laid out on the
18 site.

19 The rest of the hill was replanted. There
20 was no amendment placed.

21 MS. THOMAS: Right.

22 MS. FANELLI: And we actually didn't do
23 any significant ripping of the soil to loosen it because
24 of the steepness of the soil and based on the
25 recommendations of the geotechnical engineer.

1 So it will be very interesting to see the
2 rate -- I guess we're all hoping that everything's going
3 to ultimately thrive.

4 It's going to be different in timing for
5 how long one plot over another takes to thrive in the
6 area.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you have a
8 monitoring plan to look at mortality for everything
9 that's planted?

10 MS. FANELLI: We -- mediation does not.
11 Natural Resource does, because that is a natural resource
12 function.

13 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

14 MS. FANELLI: This just gives you
15 another -- you can see that they're planting. You can
16 see the historic forest being put back in place.

17 This is a nice shot because it gives you an
18 idea of the dry crossing between the newly reestablished
19 drainage, and if you remember last time, I showed you
20 some pictures of the very terraced supports in here, the
21 drains to that creek channel.

22 And you can see that it takes drainage from
23 behind. It comes in a pipe a short distance. It
24 discharges here, comes underneath the bridge and
25 discharges down to the wetlands.

1 The future wetland, what we call a
2 sedimentation and retention basin, but the optimal goal
3 is for that to become a volunteer wetland at the base.

4 This is a little close-up of the trees and
5 some of the grasses since we got rain in October.
6 Starting to take shape.

7 Close-up of the trees. Lots of different
8 varieties, all picked and stipulated by our forestry
9 department.

10 Here is the shelter builders planting the
11 serpentine slope. Very steep. They got this done before
12 the first rains because now that slope is pretty
13 difficult to walk on given the texture of the serpentine.

14 Here they are planting. You can see many
15 of the native grass plugs adjacent to our future wetland,
16 which is our sedimentation retention pond.

17 Another photograph of fillsite 1 and a
18 couple of bodies beginning to plant there. This is a
19 close-up of some of the trees that were transplanted, the
20 oaks from other locations in the Presidio.

21 And that's my pictures of fillsite 1,
22 landfill 2. So I actually walked there on Friday and I'm
23 impressed.

24 Unfortunately, I did run across a dog
25 walker with a pack of dogs that were not on leash;

1 managed to get a hold of one that was close to the
2 wetlands on Quarry Trail and get him back, but it's a
3 problem, a problem the Trust is actual still dealing
4 with.

5 Remediation as part of planning did put up
6 some orange fencing just as a moderate deterrent to the
7 dog walkers to try to keep them out of our newly planted
8 field.

9 Landfill E before. It's sort of before and
10 sort of after, but as you remember, it was a big flat
11 area with a lot of weeds, and it was just sitting out
12 there behind.

13 There's a little bit of work going on here.
14 The work that you see in this picture was whether we
15 first took up the mulch in the beginning of the season.

16 As you remember, we took down about 75
17 trees. Nowhere near what we did at fillsite 1, landfill
18 2, primarily around the perimeter, but we left that mulch
19 last winter as a protective barrier.

20 Very dramatically different today. We've
21 gotten a lot of compliments on it. It has a much more
22 engineered look in my opinion than fillsite 1, landfill
23 2, but as you can see, this is the flat top part which
24 would ultimately be available for future ball field
25 development.

1 There is along the east a concrete drainage
2 swale that will take water that comes from behind the
3 houses now to the toe, and then the larger more natural
4 swale that's part of native plantings is over on this far
5 side, the western side.

6 MR. BERMAN: Where is the old parking lot
7 in that picture?

8 MS. FANELLI: I believe it was asphalted.
9 It's primarily over here. There is a new flat parking
10 lot. You access it off of Quarry Road. It's a
11 completely different access point.

12 Right now, it's completely barricaded.
13 There's a big piece of k-rail so that people cannot drive
14 on to it. That's just sort of another perspective.

15 What these things are here are our landfill gas
16 vents. They're actually in chain linked fences, little
17 cages, and we are starting the monitoring program for
18 that to see if we're going to get any landfill gas at all
19 out of them.

20 But the system is designed to fit with
21 future land use, and to the extent we don't need them, we
22 hope we'll be able to tap them and kind of monitor, if we
23 don't see any gas, shut them down, but monitor our
24 high-level one to see if that changes our dynamics and to
25 see if we get gas out of the other one, and ultimately

1 shut them down.

2 If we do see gas, all of them can be active
3 at some point.

4 MR. CHESTER: I can't remember. Were
5 those engineered in some sort of like a French drain --
6 are they just single gas wells or do they have -- do they
7 widen out?

8 MS. FANELLI: It's actually a geo-
9 composite fabric. So there's a fabric that lays across
10 the entire top that is connected to these particular
11 vents on the top.

12 On the face, it is different. It's a
13 series of trenches, and that was done on purpose so that
14 we could accommodate deeper rooting plants on that face
15 sooner rather than having to wait, if we do have gas, for
16 it to kind of naturally get to a point where we can
17 penetrate that collection system.

18 MR. CHESTER: These are collecting gases
19 that --

20 MS. FANELLI: Rises from inside of the
21 landfill to the netting, the geo textile, and then it's
22 vented out.

23 MR. BERMAN: And that drainage --

24 MS. FANELLI: I thought I had more
25 pictures, but I guess I don't. Sorry.

1 MR. BERMAN: Can you go back one that
2 shows the drainage line?

3 What happens if debris gets in there after
4 a heavy rain?

5 MS. FANELLI: Here? It will be a
6 maintenance issue. Right now this comes along. There's
7 actually a drop inlet here, and it goes into a pipe, and
8 then it's dirt down in this lower area.

9 And then it -- there's another drain on the
10 street where you now drive in on Quarry Trail that goes
11 into that same drop inlet, and then it discharges at the
12 toe.

13 This drainage does not have a big drainage
14 area. It's not supposed to collect a lot of water. The
15 larger drainage area is on this side.

16 But even so, we have actually three
17 separate drainages that now drop at the toe of the
18 landfill: The western drainage, which is designed to
19 carry the most flow, this eastern drainage, which carries
20 the lesser, and then a very small drainage pipe that
21 would just drain the parking structure once it's
22 completed on top of landfill E.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: And what are the plans
24 for monitoring groundwater at the site?

25 MS. FANELLI: There's a groundwater

1 monitoring plan. It was submitted to DTSC. We received
2 comments on it, I believe, in October or early November.

3 Genevieve has turned those around and
4 submitted the groundwater plan to DTSC, and I believe we
5 just got approval of that groundwater plan either today
6 or yesterday.

7 I got an approval for something, and I
8 think it was for the groundwater monitoring plan at
9 landfill E.

10 Those wells will be installed not in time
11 to monitoring this quarter, but in time for the
12 monitoring program.

13 That monitor plan is posted at DTSC if
14 anybody wants to see it. I tried to send you all notices
15 when a plan like that got submitted, but if it got lost
16 in the wash, I can make it available to you.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you have any
18 recollection, like are there wells on the surface or are
19 they downgradient?

20 MS. FANELLI: There's two wells
21 upgradient, so this side, and then there's two wells
22 downgradient, and the design reflects the analysis that
23 Geosyntech did, and I know the guy from Geosyntech, John
24 gave a presentation here before he left for Australia.

25 So it reflects our understanding that

1 water's coming from two different sources and it has two
2 different basic general chemistries, and so we wanted to
3 be able to sample wells downgradient on both sides to see
4 if we're going to get consistent data results for that.

5 MR. CHESTER: Doug, I remember you had
6 comments on that a while back.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: I did. That was the
8 primary basis for my comments on landfill E was looking
9 at the difference upgradient, downgradient of total
10 dissolved solids and the nature of it, yeah.

11 MS. FANELLI: The plan also includes
12 surface watering, but I honestly don't in my plain right
13 now know the exact monitoring locations, but when there
14 is surface water flowing at a monitoring event, there is
15 a sample collected.

16 MR. BERMAN: And where is the local
17 housing that's nearby?

18 MS. FANELLI: You're looking at this
19 picture, to the right.

20 So you remember our big green wall that's
21 now gone and been removed? That was sort of a truck
22 barrier, if you will, for the folks living in the
23 housing. That's been taken down.

24 It is open, so you're welcome to take a
25 walk and walk through it and walk all the way around to

1 fillsite 1, landfill 2, and I'd encourage you to do it
2 when it's sunny out, because it will give you a good
3 sense of what it looks like and feels like.

4 MR. BERMAN: Can you see the steep part at
5 all? Is it exposed?

6 MS. FANELLI: The slope? If you come up
7 Barnard Avenue, you'll see it dropping off to your left,
8 and you'll see the three outfalls, and I do wish I had a
9 better picture of it. I thought I tried to get one in
10 here.

11 They're very small, actually, relative to
12 the sense of the slope, and right now, we're in the
13 process of working with planning on the planting plan for
14 that.

15 I know a fair number of native plants are
16 planned for the western channel, and along the back,
17 there's some historic forest to be reestablished, and
18 then there's a fair amount of landscape area, but I
19 believe similar to fillsite 1, the landscaping will be
20 done primarily with native plants, a good percentage of
21 them.

22 MS. GEE: Eileen, are there any signs to
23 say that the dog walkers not to go through the area?

24 MS. FANELLI: There are signs all around
25 fillsite 1, landfill 2 that I saw on Friday that say:

1 "Under restoration. Please control your dogs."

2 MS. GEE: Did they remove the sign -- not
3 the sign. The green vent, they'll be even more open.

4 MS. FANELLI: The dogs are an acknowledged
5 problem, and obviously those signs are up and there was a
6 guy shouting at two of these big dogs.

7 Fortunately, they're well behaved, because
8 I was walking my dog at the time, which is about this
9 big, and there was this dog that was about this big, and
10 it was kind enough dog, I was able to lead him back over.

11 There are just bad actors when it comes to
12 the dog walkers.

13 I don't know. This is off the record, but
14 there's some preference for them to use landfill E right
15 now because it's not replanted, and we'd rather have them
16 here than fillsite 1, landfill 2 because we don't want
17 damage to the plants that we put out there.

18 But we would like to have them all under
19 control all the time.

20 MR. BERMAN: The steep part there at the
21 downgradient, is it accessible or is it closed off?

22 MS. FANELLI: It's not accessible from the
23 sense that there's no trails or any way to walk there
24 comfortably. There's no fence that keeps you physically
25 from getting there if you're determined to get there.

1 MR. BERMAN: But the vegetation has been
2 removed, right?

3 MS. FANELLI: It has been removed berm.

4 MR. BERMAN: So if you wanted to --

5 MS. FANELLI: If you wanted to, you could
6 run down that hill.

7 MR. BERMAN: Not that I have any plans or
8 desire, but I'm just thinking of other folks that live
9 around there.

10 MS. FANELLI: I haven't seen anybody on
11 that slope. I would think a dog might run down it more
12 than a person. It's not inviting to a walker.

13 I haven't seen any kids out there from the
14 neighborhood playing, but I haven't been out there all
15 that much myself.

16 I don't know if you have.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Kids are infinitely
18 creative with slopes.

19 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

20 MR. BERMAN: It's not so many kids. It's
21 the adventurous mountain biker.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

23 MS. FANELLI: I haven't seen any bikes,
24 and I don't know of any reports.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you know what the

1 nature of the discussions around the dog walking thing?
2 Is that a long-term thing? Are people looking at
3 really -- given all this restoration that's going on, to
4 really at least protect these areas?

5 MS. FANELLI: I'm not involved in it at
6 all. I would go over to here. I'm honestly not invited
7 into any of the Trust discussions over the dog walking
8 policy.

9 MS. ANDERSEN: I'm kind of a little bit on
10 the fringe of that, too. At least the Trust, they're
11 sort of in a wait and see mode to see what GGNRA does
12 with their drawing management plan and the rules that
13 they end up promulgating.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Just from your comments
15 with -- I've noticed that as the dog walking community
16 establishes their sort of rights in an area, they
17 establish themselves well, we are here and we're doing our
18 thing and that means it's okay.

19 So I just -- would it be beneficial for
20 various groups to write a letter in support of protecting
21 these newly restored areas? Would that be useful for the
22 Trust?

23 MS. ANDERSEN: From what I understand
24 right now, we are limited in what we can do as far as
25 enforcement because what the park police will do with

1 respect to issuing tickets, because we're in the
2 process -- we're not in the process of rulemaking, but
3 GGNRA is in the process of rulemaking.

4 So we're kind of -- that's what I said.
5 It's a problem right now. It's a problem with
6 enforcement because they don't enforce while this problem
7 is going on.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: We would write them if
9 we would write anybody.

10 MS. ANDERSEN: I believe their public
11 comment time is closed. I'm not the dog person, but I
12 believe their comment time is closed. It doesn't mean
13 you can't write something on it.

14 I think another thing that we're looking at
15 it, too, what's the city doing. The city is looking at
16 regulating at least commercial dog walking.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I was hearing that on
18 the radio.

19 MS. ANDERSEN: That's another opportunity
20 to comment there, and maybe we'll find some sort of
21 consistency.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: My inquiry is just
23 about protecting these sites given the millions that
24 we've put into it.

25 MS. FANELLI: And this site, there's not

1 much a dog can do, honestly, unless there was a cadre of
2 them digging very, very deep holes.

3 But it is an issue at fillsite 1, landfill
4 2 where we have invested a fair amount of money planting
5 plants that have been propagated from a small pool with
6 lots of loving care. So we don't want to see those
7 damaged.

8 Okay. Moving on -- I know you want to hear
9 Andrea's presentation, too.

10 Where are we? RAP4. We actually just
11 completed the construction completion report for DTSC for
12 review.

13 I will forward you a copy of that notice,
14 because I know I have not copied the RAB on it yet.

15 We just sent it to them on the 8th, and if
16 you want to come and take a look at it, you're more than
17 welcome to take a look at it.

18 Fillsite 1, landfill 2, RAP 5A. We're
19 looking at submitting that to DTSC in January.

20 Baker Beach 1A we talked about. The draft
21 RI report was submitted to DTSC several months ago. We
22 are currently working on the draft FS/RAP. It is
23 actually in review with the Park Service today and we're
24 hoping to submit it to DTSC following Park Service's
25 review in the January time frame.

1 So you'll see a lot. These guys know
2 there's a lot coming to them in the January/February time
3 frame.

4 Landfill E, we're basically done there.
5 We're in our monitoring mode, because we brought in fills
6 from the East Bay with some weed seed which may be in
7 excess of what we anticipated or weeds that we would
8 normally encounter here.

9 We do have a program in place. Shelter
10 Bell will be implementing it to inspect the landfills
11 on -- that landfill on a regular basis and basically kill
12 anything that grows so that we can get ahead of any weeds
13 that may propagate before we plant next year.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: The planting schedule
15 is out there quite a ways, actually.

16 MS. FANELLI: It is. There's a typo. We
17 don't have to worry about what it will look like.

18 On Baker Beach 2, we do have a draft RI.
19 I'm hoping to send it to the Park Service in the next
20 couple of weeks.

21 That likely following -- it's the holidays,
22 so Park Service review will get to DTSC in the February
23 or later time frame.

24 Battery Howe Wagner, 6B. Mike Beck, who
25 was talking to you about 207/231, has completed the

1 analysis that exists for Battery Howe Wagner and made
2 some recommendations and is doing the same for fillsite
3 6B.

4 Neither of those reports are completely
5 final, but our goal is to submit those to DTSC for
6 discussion and review in the January time frame, and then
7 Mountain Lake, which we'll talk more about tonight. We
8 had submitted the RI to DTSC. The RI report has been
9 approved.

10 I know last time and at the public meeting,
11 there had been some discussion about sampling the --
12 portions of the sediment and beach in the city's
13 jurisdiction.

14 We did sample that a week and a half ago
15 Friday. We did get the results back, and everything is
16 under our screening levels for that site. So that's very
17 good news.

18 Our hunch is that we didn't have a problem
19 on the city property. It looks like it's supported by
20 the data we collected. So that is good news.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: Were there detections
22 of lead?

23 MS. FANELLI: If they were, they were
24 all -- this is just from Genevieve. This is all
25 preliminary draft.

1 When I talked to her at lunch before coming
2 here, she indicated to me that lead was detected. At the
3 highest, it was less than twenty milligrams per kilogram.
4 So -- or parts per million. So much lower than any of
5 our action levels.

6 In the sediment and in the sand, because
7 DTSC did ask us to collect samples of the beach sand, and
8 we did do that, and it all came up in good shape. So
9 we're very pleased with that.

10 Building 937, the remedial construction is
11 substantially complete. We had one little hiccup. The
12 backfill rock that was brought in didn't meet durability
13 requirements, so we had a week and a half downtime where
14 we mashed with the contractor what to do about that.

15 Ultimately that was taken up and new rock
16 was brought in, so we got the stuff we needed, and they
17 did begin pouring their concrete slab today. I think
18 they are still pouring tomorrow and the next day.

19 It will have a thirty-day cure, so we'll
20 have at least a week where nobody can walk in the
21 building and a month before any vehicles can go into the
22 building.

23 That site technically won't be done until
24 June, but we're going to do our construction completion
25 report. We'll likely hold that until we collect the sub

1 slab samples for vapor. There is the vapor system
2 installed beneath the slab.

3 But that site went very well. Our
4 confirmation samples were well below any action if not
5 non-detect for the VOC concern for that site, as well.

6 207/231, the in-situ treatment is basically
7 done. We did some sampling since the last time I was
8 here. We have some basic data results north of the wall.

9 We do have some gas that's above our
10 cleanup objective. I think our objective is a hundred
11 parts per million. We have stuff in the order of 200,
12 maybe 300 at the highest.

13 The interference there is oils and greases.
14 So we know we can't get any lower with this technology
15 north of the wall.

16 South of the wall, we have a hotspot where
17 I think it's a little bit above 300. So we're running
18 the system another few weeks, and I think Ryan went out
19 there today and collected another confirmation sample in
20 that area to see if we can't get it to our action, which
21 is one hundred.

22 So our intent is to run that system on the
23 south side of the wall to get to the proper limits, but
24 we're going to be shutting down the system north of the
25 wall at this point.

1 And primarily because we have another bite
2 at the apple north of the wall. When we do the
3 excavation, we can go back in at that point and grab a
4 few things if we really need to at that point.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Building 937, did you
6 actually find a source of the VOC contamination?

7 MS. FANELLI: No.

8 Lead-based paint. As of the quarterly
9 report, we had submitted 315 packages asking for no
10 further action, and DTSC had approved 255 of them, so
11 that program is moving along under the skill and
12 oversight of Nina and with the support of DTSC. So no
13 surprises or news there.

14 Next quarter. Some of this is old news.
15 We have completed the planting at fillsite 1, landfill 2.
16 We're fussing with the irrigation system right now.

17 We can talk more about this. Actually DTSC
18 is here. On Mountain Lake, we're talking about planning
19 another public information meeting, probably in the
20 January -- late January time frame.

21 We're working hard on the FS draft for
22 Mountain Lake and we anticipate getting that submitted.
23 The same with the Baker Beach 1A site.

24 That's obviously under review with the Park
25 Service, and once that's done, we'll be submitting it,

1 and we do have a draft RI in the works, and the data for
2 Battery Howe Wagner at 6B.

3 We're hopefully decommissioning the system
4 end of January at the 228 historic wall.

5 I didn't talk much about this, but I think
6 you were copied from Agnes. She asked us to do a little
7 bit more investigations, or if they didn't copy.

8 She asked us to do more investigation on
9 the 1213.1 tank site. I think it's one of our only
10 little tank sites where we're -- we have a well, but it
11 was cross-gradient, not downgradient technically.

12 So we had a little bit of challenges
13 documenting that we had a stable site condition.

14 We did some additional investigation, so
15 that report has been submitted to Agnes and she's looking
16 at it now.

17 MR. CHESTER: What was a fuel tank or what
18 was it?

19 MS. FANELLI: It was an old fuel tank.

20 MR. CHESTER: So gasoline?

21 MS. FANELLI: Whatever the fuel oil that
22 they used. I don't know if it was kerosene -- I don't
23 think it was the heavy bunker oil, but whatever it was
24 that they used, and lead-based paint, we're going to
25 continue to submit our closures.

1 So that's sort of the overall program
2 review.

3 Any questions on that? Or I'm going to
4 turn it over to Andrea.

5 MS. ANDERSEN: I think all have of you
6 know me, but for those of you that don't, I'm the
7 environmental attorney for the Trust.

8 I began working for the Trust in September
9 of 2005, and literally the second day I came do work for
10 the Trust, I had a meeting with Terri Thomas about trying
11 to get funding for the remediation of Mountain Lake.

12 So this is a project that I've been working
13 on for quite a long time, and I'm happy to report that
14 we've come to a very positive resolution.

15 So I'm going to talk about several things,
16 give you a little bit of background, talk about the 1938
17 permit whereby then the Department of War gave the
18 California Highway Commission permission to build a road
19 that we call today Highway 1 or Park Presidio Boulevard,
20 talk a little bit about something near and dear to my
21 heart, which is a summary judgment order.

22 Maybe the lawyers will only care about that
23 portion of my talk, and then talk about what's in the
24 draft consent decree and what's the process going forward
25 for getting that approved.

1 So what is the basis here for the claim?

2 Well, initially, just to give you a little bit more
3 background, the Trust, along with the Army and along with
4 the Department of Justice, we worked for quite a while
5 with Caltrans to try to do something before we finally
6 ended up filing a complaint in the case, and then when we
7 filed the complaint, strangely enough, this is about
8 remediation, so we must have filed this complaint about
9 some sort of environmental cleanup law. We actually
10 didn't.

11 We filed the complaint based on the
12 original 1938 permit whereby, like I said before, the
13 Department of War gave California permission to build the
14 road, and when you take a look at that permit -- which
15 you can take a look at it if you want to. At the end of
16 my presentation, I'll give you a website that you can go
17 to.

18 The original permit is actually attached to
19 the consent decree, so you can see the words that were in
20 the original 1938 permit, but it was our opinion when we
21 filed the complaint that this permit has some really good
22 language in it.

23 In fact, one of the things it says is:

24 "The road herein shall be operated and maintained without
25 expense to the War Department." So that was sort of our

1 premise here is the Department of War gave California
2 permission to build this road, but it wasn't allowed to
3 affect the Presidio and any costs associated with the
4 road were going to be borne by the State of California.

5 So our case, when we went forward, we really
6 were asking for three things within the case, so I'll
7 kind of explain it.

8 I think all of you understand that one of
9 the things we're asking for, the cleanup here at Mountain
10 Lake.

11 Another thing that we were asking for,
12 though, the reason why, in our opinion, Mountain Lake got
13 contaminated that there were actually storm drains along
14 here from the road that allowed the storm water from the
15 road to directly discharge into Mountain Lake.

16 So one of the things that we want to change
17 at the end of the day of the case was that those direct
18 discharges would no longer be permitted into Mountain
19 Lake.

20 And then finally you can see here this
21 thing that's called the overflow pipeline. When the road
22 was built, the road actually ended up filling in quite a
23 portion of the lake.

24 So the lake wants to rise to its natural
25 level, but if it was to rise to its natural level, it's

1 going to undermine the road.

2 So Caltrans put this thing that's called on
3 this map up here the overflow pipeline, and over time,
4 the overflow pipeline had become degraded.

5 So there were portions of the pipeline
6 where the water was coming out, and we thought it had the
7 potential to impact Lobos Creek, which is the drinking
8 water supply of the Presidio.

9 So we wanted Caltrans, as well, to repair
10 that overflow pipeline. Those were the three main things
11 that we were seeking as part of the lawsuit.

12 So, you know, both sides made their
13 arguments back and forth. We finally filed the lawsuit
14 actually in January of 2009, and then in beginning of
15 last year is when the summary judgment order came out for
16 the judgment, and that's the judge saying what was her
17 opinion on our legal argument, and when we went forward
18 to the judge, we only asked the judge to give her opinion
19 on whether or not Caltrans was liable under the
20 agreement.

21 We didn't ask for her opinion on damages,
22 how much Caltrans had to pay us. We just wanted her
23 opinion on whether or not Caltrans is liable under the
24 agreement.

25 So these are some of the things that the

1 judge wrote when she wrote her opinion. First off, we
2 were happy to see that she agreed with us that this is
3 still a valid agreement, the 1938 permit is and was a
4 forceful agreement, and she agreed with our basic
5 premise, which was that it was the intent of the parties
6 when they entered this agreement that the United States
7 would not have to bear any of the costs of this road.

8 Again, this is a published opinion. You
9 can take a look at what she has to say. It comes across
10 very clear in her opinion, look, California, you got to
11 use this property for free.

12 So it's part of the bargain for you getting
13 to use this property for free, but you have to make sure
14 the United States is whole at the end of the day. You
15 have to make sure there are no damages that the United
16 States has to pay for.

17 The judge also agreed that the runoff from
18 the road into Mountain Lake that contains contaminants
19 are considered damages under the agreement.

20 That was something very important for us,
21 and obviously, too, that the costs that we have for the
22 cleanup as well as any repairs of the overflow pipeline
23 is something else that are damages under the agreement
24 that were the responsibility of Caltrans, and that
25 finally Caltrans was required under specific language in

1 the agreement to build culverts or other facilities that
2 we felt, the United States felt were necessary.

3 Some of those, of course, were this idea
4 that we want those drainage facilities fixed so that they
5 no longer drain directly into Mountain lake.

6 So we got together after the judge made
7 this wonderful ruling that I think one day I'll frame
8 some of it on my wall. She made this wonderful ruling
9 for us, and so it was very logical from that point
10 forward that for both sides to get together and to come
11 to terms on something, because the only thing that's
12 remaining then were what were the damages. How were we
13 going to fix these problems that the judge recognized or
14 out there.

15 So we got together with Caltrans. I will
16 tell you from that point forward, Caltrans has been
17 great. I mean, we've really been working very
18 cooperatively with them to try to come up with workable
19 solutions.

20 MR. BERMAN: Can I ask you a question
21 here?

22 MS. ANDERSEN: Sure.

23 MR. BERMAN: Who gave permission to
24 Caltrans to build those original storm drains that were
25 on the north side of the lake that caused the

1 contamination?

2 MS. ANDERSEN: All of the plans for that
3 system were approved by the owner. In fact, that's kind
4 of an interesting point that Caltrans did bring up in
5 litigation is that look, the Army approved the plan.

6 So that obviously meant they approved the
7 solution, but the judge didn't buy that argument.

8 But there's no question the Army did
9 approve the plans, and in fact, what's kind of
10 interesting getting into the history of it is that the
11 Army did not want any of the discharge to go into what
12 they considered to be their installation.

13 So they didn't want it spilling off of the
14 road anywhere else. They acquiesced of it going into
15 Mountain Lake. There's no question about it.

16 I'm pointing to Terri because Terri got
17 deposed in this case and in the desert case, and one of
18 the things that comes out when you take a look at it,
19 they designed Mountain Lake to be a storm water retention
20 basin is really what they did.

21 When you take a look at how the road
22 worked, that's how they designed it.

23 MS. FANELLI: And from an engineering
24 perspective, it functions very well as a retention basin.
25 Not so much from a freshwater water habitat.

1 MR. BERMAN: That's why this question came
2 to my mind is that, in fact, the Army was participatory
3 in causing the pollution in mountain lake.

4 So in a sense, I don't know whether it was
5 on the basis of ignorance, not knowing anything, but that
6 doesn't count in the legal situation. The Army was
7 responsible.

8 I mean, it seems to me the judge could have
9 said, "Look here, we, the State of California were
10 concerned about the drainage of the storm water."

11 MS. ANDERSEN: Uh-huh.

12 MR. BERMAN: And the Army gave us
13 permission to use additional portions of the Presidio to
14 handle this runoff. So the Army was, in fact, negligent
15 in guarding its own property.

16 MS. ANDERSEN: Well, that may be true, but
17 I'll tell you, there's another wonderful paragraph in
18 this 1938 permit that says that if in the opinion of the
19 Secretary of War or his authorized representative any
20 construction authorized here under -- that's what this
21 was, authorized under, shall now or hereafter tend to
22 affect or affect the use of land for United States or
23 other public purposes, without expense to the War
24 Department make any change or changes in the Department's
25 land of any alteration, relocation, reconstruction or

1 replacement of any existing, blah-blah-blah.

2 So I said the court said look, they thought
3 about that, and no matter what, it's the responsibility
4 of Caltrans.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Also, isn't another factor
6 that the pollution was different in 1938 than what it was
7 later?

8 MS. ANDERSEN: You know, I think one of
9 the things that influenced the judge is something that
10 happened in 1941, and in 1941, originally -- here. I'll
11 back up a little bit to this slide here. I'm going
12 forward, sorry.

13 In 1941, the overflow pipeline didn't do
14 this. Before 1941, this overflow pipeline actually
15 directly discharged into Lobos Creek, and the Army came
16 back -- even though they'd approved that plan, too.

17 They came back to Caltrans and said, "You
18 know what? We've come to find out that we really don't
19 like it that this overflow pipeline is directly flowing
20 into our water source. We can't use the water. So you
21 need to change that so it's no longer directly
22 discharging into our water source."

23 I think that influenced the judge, because
24 the judge said, "Look. Obviously, even back in 1941,
25 they recognized the fact that we can learn something. So

1 even original plans might not work. It's still the
2 responsibility of Caltrans to fix it," and one of the
3 things that both parties contemplated was environmental
4 harm, something needed to be fixed, because that's what
5 happened back in 1941.

6 So I think that impacted the judge quite a
7 bit.

8 MR. BERMAN: At that point, who was -- who
9 paid for the realignment?

10 MS. ANDERSEN: Caltrans. I should say
11 then the Cal Department of Highways.

12 MR. BERMAN: Right. So there was already
13 precedent.

14 MS. ANDERSEN: There was precedent for
15 what we were talking about, that's correct.

16 Okay. So what does the consent decree say?
17 Well, it deals again with these really -- these two
18 pieces that I talked about before.

19 First of all, Caltrans is going to give the
20 Presidio Trust 5.5 million dollars to help pay for the
21 remediation amount.

22 And then second of all, something that was
23 important to us is that we realized very quickly that the
24 remediation of Mountain Lake may impact the highway,
25 because if you're going to be taking out the sediment,

1 this road already right now isn't tremendously stable.

2 They found that back out, what was it? In
3 1989 in the earthquake. It's not all that stable. It's
4 on sand. It shifts.

5 So we said as part of the settlement, too,
6 that if there's any highway stabilization that's needed,
7 that that's Caltrans' responsibility.

8 They needed to determine what highway
9 stabilization is needed and then they need to take care
10 of any highway stabilization that's necessary for us to
11 proceed forward with the remediation.

12 Second of all, the storm drain that we
13 don't like, that we call that under the consent decree
14 the diversion component, so we are in essence telling
15 Caltrans that they can no longer directly discharge those
16 storm drains into Mountain Lake.

17 We also recognized the fact within the
18 consent decree that they may not be able to complete that
19 before we complete the remediation, and so that
20 remediation is not delayed, while we're waiting for the
21 diversion component to be completely designed, they're
22 going to install temporary measures so that there will
23 not be a direct discharge from the road into Mountain
24 Lake, you know, after it's cleaned up.

25 There may be a point in time where there's

1 these temporary measures in place until we can design
2 both the overflow component and the diversion component.

3 MR. BERMAN: Sorry to interrupt you, but
4 if there's an overrun on the cost, will the insurance
5 cover it?

6 MS. ANDERSEN: The insurance only covers
7 the remediation portion. So the only portion of this
8 consent decree that intersects with the environmental
9 insurance policy is the payment of the 5.5 million
10 dollars for the remediation.

11 The other two components have nothing to do
12 with the insurance policy.

13 So it's totally Caltrans' responsibility to
14 take care of the diversion component. As part of the
15 negotiations, the Trust took on the responsibility to
16 take care of the overflow pipeline.

17 That has nothing to do with the insurance
18 company, because it has nothing to do with remediation.
19 It's nothing they would ever cover under the policy.

20 So we then will be paid four million
21 dollars by Caltrans, and then we will be designing and
22 doing the construction of the overflow pipeline.

23 Those two pieces have to work together, the
24 diversion component and the overflow pipeline, because
25 it's our thought that the way it's going to work in the

1 future is that we're basically going to connect up
2 those -- what used to be the storm drain.

3 Instead, we're going to pipe that into the
4 overflow pipeline and use the overflow pipeline, then, to
5 get rid of the storm water discharge so it's no longer
6 going directly into Mountain Lake.

7 If you read the consent decree, that's
8 somewhat open-ended. Why? Because we still need to do
9 our planning for those two things.

10 At the federal agency, we need to do
11 environmental planning under the National Environmental
12 Policy Act. As a state agency, Caltrans has to do their
13 planning under the California Environmental Quality act.

14 We contemplate in the consent decree that
15 we will do that under some kind of joint document. Those
16 will be corrected after. There's no way that you can fix
17 the divorce and the pipeline without those two working
18 together.

19 MS. SEGAL: And the overflow pipeline,
20 then, you've got Lobos Creek to the east, you've got
21 Mountain Lake to the east of the highway.

22 So what are the general thoughts about
23 where the overflow component is going to wind up?

24 MS. ANDERSEN: Right now the overflow
25 pipeline connects directly into the City of San Francisco

1 sewer system. So that's one option is simply to repair
2 the existing pipeline and continue to discharge into the
3 CCSF system.

4 Another potential is to take the overflow
5 water from Mountain -- really, the thought -- I'm not an
6 engineer, so you can listen to my lawyer explanation, but
7 there'll be a pipe like this where the dirty water, if
8 you will, the initial close off the road will go into the
9 system, and then once it raises up to a certain level,
10 the excess above that would then discharge all the way
11 down to Baker Beach.

12 So those are the two most promising
13 engineering takes on it right now, but that's something,
14 like I said.

15 The consent decree establishes a working --
16 what we thought at the time would be a way to make these
17 two projects work, but we still have to go through the
18 planning, and, that's all open to future analysis, but we
19 have to set a price on it.

20 That's how we came up with the four million
21 dollars, because we had to price one way or doing it.

22 So we actually priced away of doing it
23 where we would actually take it all the way out to Baker
24 Beach.

25 MS. SEGAL: Where, if anywhere, is the

1 City of San Francisco? Because I don't know if they have
2 actually ownership of part of Mountain Lake, but
3 somewhere, Mountain Lake the City has.

4 Are they a party to the lawsuit?

5 MS. ANDERSEN: They're not a party to the
6 lawsuit. Hypothetically they could be a party, because
7 they potentially own part of Mountain Lake.

8 There's really only two portions that they
9 would be interested in. One, they would be interested in
10 making sure that their portion of Mountain Lake is taken
11 care of.

12 The other thing they would be interested in
13 is as a receiver of any of the discharge.

14 We've already started meeting with them and
15 Caltrans.

16 MS. FANELLI: The meeting with the City is
17 solely technical. They're not at the table for any of
18 this discussion, but Caltrans and the Trust have sat with
19 San Francisco PUC officials and begun to talk about the
20 technical challenges and issues.

21 Only in the preliminary sense, because it's
22 part of developing alternatives that then would be
23 subject to environmental review under NEPA and CEQA
24 before a final decision is made.

25 But we don't want to postulate things that

1 aren't technically feasible. So we're trying to work
2 with them to identify what could happen or not happen and
3 identify the constraints.

4 MS. ANDERSEN: To be honest, the overflow
5 pipe is actually the hardest part of this whole thing,
6 because there's more unknowns with respect to the
7 overflow pipeline than anything else. It was actually
8 the hardest thing to work out.

9 FACILITATOR KERN: The overflow pipe has
10 been a question for a long time, and we so appreciate
11 that we're talking about it.

12 It occurs to me -- and I never thought
13 about this -- that the level of the lake was being
14 controlled by that overflow pipe, as well.

15 MS. ANDERSEN: Mm-hmm. That's why it was
16 built. It was built to control the level of the lake so
17 it doesn't get too high.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, it strikes me
19 with the restoration of the -- I guess the east arm and
20 how water will be at what level is that being considered
21 in this whole process, what level of the lake do we want
22 in the future and how's that related to the stabilization
23 of the road?

24 It's just another part of the whole
25 problem, I guess.

1 MS. ANDERSEN: Right. I'm certain that
2 that will be something that will be analyzed in the
3 future as part of this whole process for the diversion
4 component and the overflow pipeline component.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's not a component of the
6 remediation analysis.

7 MS. ANDERSEN: Right, right.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, sure, but it's
9 obviously connected to the restoration.

10 MS. FANELLI: It is part of some of the
11 enhancement analysis that's going on, but we are working
12 with Caltrans in terms of what they say from an
13 engineering standpoint, what they can reasonably do to
14 stabilize their road.

15 The issue with the high water is it creates
16 core pressures, and under a seismic event, they will lose
17 the structural integrity of the roadway.

18 So there is only a certain amount of
19 engineering tolerance that they can take for raising of
20 water level.

21 I don't think Caltrans likes a lot of
22 fluctuation, either.

23 MS. THOMAS: But we have asked the
24 question. We've asked the question about how high we can
25 go.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.

2 MS. ANDERSEN: And that's another point
3 that the City has a certain opinion, too, because the
4 higher the lake goes, the less beach they have.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, and I've seen,
6 you know -- when that overflow pipe got clogged up or
7 turned off, there was practically no beach and the steps
8 were submerged.

9 Another thing that's coming to mind -- and
10 perhaps this is being considered, as well, but with the
11 discovery at fillsite 1, landfill 2 of that Mountain Lake
12 tunnel, I'm wondering if that is having any impact on the
13 discussions about water going that way towards --

14 MS. ANDERSEN: I haven't heard anything.
15 The only thing I've heard when we're talking about design
16 of the east arm is being cognizant of maybe trying to
17 work that in to, you know, recognition of the other end.

18 But I don't even think they know where the
19 other end is.

20 MS. THOMAS: We're surmising where it is
21 based on topography and historical documents. We're
22 definitely looking at it and seeing if we can find it,
23 and in fact we have a meeting on it tomorrow trying to
24 figure out what the issues with the tunnel will be.

25 But that doesn't so much affect the

1 Mountain Lake project, as the east arm project.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. I'm just
3 throwing it out there as things occurring to me. It's so
4 great to hear some details.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's part of remediation.
6 The tunnel outlet at landfill 2 is 28 to 25 or thirty
7 feet with below grade now. So it's completely reburied
8 with compacted soil on top of it.

9 You could still have a hydraulic influence,
10 but it's not an acute influence. It's not like you see
11 water pouring through it. It's -- it's kind of sealed
12 from that standpoint.

13 MR. BERMAN: But it potentially
14 geologically could have been a way of controlling the
15 flow --

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

17 MR. BERMAN: -- without having this other
18 control, if it actually is sufficiently -- as the geology
19 and the gradient is such, that could have been a
20 mechanism of controlling the lake height without ever
21 introducing this other problem wicked affect the road,
22 too.

23 If you could close that off and get rid of
24 it, that might be an improvement in terms of the long-
25 term stability.

1 FACILITATOR KERN: Very interesting.

2 MR. BERMAN: It's just a --

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah.

4 MR. BERMAN: It's just that for someone
5 that doesn't know anything about this, it just occurred
6 to me that part of the problem is the overflow pipeline,
7 if that disappeared, there could be cost savings and also
8 a very -- better way of dealing with the instability of
9 the tunnel in that old road.

10 You don't have to deal with the overflow,
11 and there's also more problems for the -- the drinking
12 water problem. Everything goes away.

13 MS. ANDERSEN: As far as I know right now,
14 I don't know of a way to control the level of the lake
15 except through the overflow pipeline, you know, based on
16 current existing conditions, and like I said, we're going
17 to work on what should be the right level.

18 I know right now, the way the system works,
19 the overflow pipeline works because you get on to Highway
20 1, you have to lift off -- you have to just block part of
21 the highway and you have to actually go in there with
22 this weird tool to open and close the valve.

23 I can tell you that that's not how it will
24 work in the future, you know. We're going to try to
25 design some system -- I understand a system in the lake

1 that gets to that level and then it will start spill into
2 it.

3 Anything below that level, it won't spill
4 into it. It's not going to be with this really barbaric
5 system they have now, that having places on the highway.

6 MS. FANELLI: There's a possibility. It
7 will have some type of telemetry so that it can be
8 remotely monitored.

9 MS. CHEEVER: Who has been managing the
10 valve? Caltrans.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: That's a funny question,
12 too, because in our opinion, it's Caltrans' valve, and in
13 their opinion, it's our lake.

14 It's actually been like this very detente
15 thing where we call each other up and we say, "The lake
16 is too high" and they'll tell us they think the lake is
17 too high.

18 The Trust had to engineer the tool. It had
19 been lost somewhere. They didn't realize for years that
20 this overflow thing really existed, the Trust didn't, and
21 they found it, and then they opened it up and then all of
22 a sudden we had turbidity in Lobos Creek and then we
23 closed it again.

24 So we think it had been open for a number
25 of years, and then finally we learned we can open and

1 close it.

2 It had been sort in a half open position or
3 a quarter open. I think it was open 25 percent for a
4 number of years.

5 We finally worked it out between us and
6 Caltrans at the beginning of the wet season, it's closed.
7 At some point in wet season, when it gets too high, we'll
8 open it, and at the end of the season, when it becomes
9 dry, we'll close it again.

10 We've had to manage it between the two of
11 us, and that's why we're hoping, too, that in the future,
12 we're not going to have to -- it's not going to be that
13 intensive of a management thing.

14 We're going to be able to work out some way
15 of remotely operating this or passively operating it so
16 people aren't going to have to go out there with tools to
17 open and close this valve.

18 MS. SEGAL: The overflow pipeline, any
19 part related to -- remember when we went out to the
20 street because, there's the clogging.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: No.

22 MS. SEGAL: Overflow pipeline, it doesn't
23 drain anywhere near.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: It's underneath that
25 area, generally.

1 MS. SEGAL: But the --

2 MS. FANELLI: You mean the puddles?

3 MS. ANDERSEN: It has nothing to do with
4 that.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's 25 feet below that
6 pipeline. It's been completely repaired. I think it's
7 been repaired for over a year now.

8 MS. SEGAL: I was remembering that. Okay.

9 MR. BERMAN: Just a quick question on
10 education. If the diversion is not part of the
11 remediation, if the diversion wasn't cured, then the
12 remediation would fail after a while.

13 MS. ANDERSEN: Well --

14 MR. BERMAN: So I don't quite understand
15 how one can conclude that the diversion isn't part of the
16 remediation, and therefore it shouldn't be also covered
17 by the insurance.

18 MS. ANDERSEN: Well, let me see if I can
19 say this right. First of all, we think that the main
20 reason why there's pollution in Mountain Lake is because
21 of leaded fuel.

22 We don't have leaded fuel anymore, so that
23 portion of the pollution, if you will, that went into
24 Mountain Lake isn't happening.

25 You're still going to get a certain amount

1 of metals or other petroleum products that are going to
2 go into the lake, but right now if you take a look at the
3 permits that Caltrans has, they're not in violation of
4 any of their permits with how these storm drains
5 currently operate.

6 So one can say that a regulatory body
7 wouldn't have any authority to tell them to change it.
8 We, though, as the permit holder have the authority to
9 tell them to change it.

10 So that's why it's being changed under the
11 permit. It's not being changed as part of the
12 remediation.

13 MR. BERMAN: So it's really -- I mean,
14 it's not an argument based on logic. It's an argument
15 based on the pragmatic method of dealing with it.

16 MS. ANDERSEN: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. BERMAN: But by so doing, it's removed
18 from the consideration of the insurance, right? Because
19 if it was really part of the remediation, then it would
20 be considered as a new problem and could be --

21 MS. ANDERSEN: Arguably, it could, but
22 it's not -- I can tell you right now it's not in the
23 draft FS/RAP. It's not part of the remediation.

24 MS. FANELLI: What is in the draft FS/RAP,
25 and will be included under CEQA is their temporary

1 activities. So they are going to be putting in best
2 management practices.

3 Their glorified oil/water separators and
4 filter systems in that those storm drains that will
5 function and hopefully will function before we do
6 remediation, so we have that added element of protection.

7 Also, what's going to be covered in the
8 CEQA document is their stabilization. So Caltrans is
9 funding it and paying for it.

10 It may not include coverage under the
11 insurance policy, but it is part of the remediation from
12 the standpoint it needs to be done to allow remediation
13 to happen.

14 So it will -- you will see those two
15 activities, the temporary activity, diversion and the
16 stabilization in the CEQA documents being drafted for the
17 first cut.

18 You know, it's DTSC's document, so we're
19 taking their direction, but obviously you all know that
20 we do the first draft.

21 So we are including that in that draft, and
22 we have had discussions with DTSC and Caltrans on the
23 scope of that work and how it will be presented in the
24 CEQA document.

25 MR. BERMAN: So we don't care about the

1 insurance because Caltrans will pay the bill?

2 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We have coverage for
3 it under Caltrans, yes.

4 MS. ANDERSEN: Okay. And then a couple
5 other things in the consent decree, one of which is we
6 felt that we should be placed back in the position we
7 were before we had to take this action against Caltrans.

8 So Caltrans will be paying the Trust
9 \$500,000 for any of our legal fees that we had to incur
10 to take this action forward.

11 And then something that was very important
12 to us, too, which is we obviously like those paragraphs
13 in the 1938 agreement. We don't want that agreement
14 changed nor do we want the judge's ruling in this case
15 changed.

16 So by the fact that we've signed the
17 consent decree, nothing changes either of those two
18 documents that we happen to like quite a bit.

19 So how do we proceed forward from this
20 point? Well, the consent decree was lodged with the
21 court on the 10th of November, and you can see all these
22 documents now that I'm referring to if you go to that
23 final website right there, the Department of Justice
24 website.

25 It was lodged with the court, and then on

1 the 23rd of November, the consent decree notice was
2 placed in the Federal Register, and so it's out right now
3 for thirty-day comment period.

4 MS. FANELLI: And I believe I copied you
5 all on the actual consent decree. So you all have copies
6 and can read it.

7 MS. ANDERSEN: What's a little bit
8 different from this consent decree, most of the time when
9 the Department of Justice lodges a consent decree,
10 because contained within the consent decree is the actual
11 remedy that's going to be proposed for a site.

12 You will see this remedy composed in this
13 consent decree. It just deals with exchange of money
14 with respect to the remediation site and how we're going
15 to fix the storm drains and how we're going to fix to the
16 overflow pipeline. So it's a little bit different than
17 what you see in most consent decrees.

18 Once that thirty-day comment period is
19 concluded, then the Department of Justice is going to
20 take a look at the comments that come forward, is going
21 to answer those comments in a way that they feel is
22 appropriate to be able to tell the judge whether or not
23 they think the consent decree should go forward as it is
24 or if it needs to be changed or not, and then once their
25 position is put forward to the judge, then the judge can

1 make decision on whether or not consent decree is going
2 to be approved or not at that point in time.

3 So I don't imagine, since if you do the
4 math, you know, 23rd of November, thirty days is up on
5 the 23rd of December.

6 I'm not thinking that anything's going to
7 happen on this until the first of the year, is probably
8 when the Department of Justice will go back before the
9 judge and let the judge know what comments they've
10 received, what their responses will be on those comments
11 and whether or not they think this consent decree needs
12 to be changed or not in response to those comments.

13 So we'd imagine sometime in the new year,
14 we're going to get approval on the consent decree and
15 then start moving forward even more with Caltrans, but
16 like we already indicated, we're already having meetings
17 with Caltrans.

18 We're already working very cooperatively
19 with them, and really, it's been a great process moving
20 forward once the decision was made to settle the case.

21 MR. BERMAN: Were you the lead attorney
22 for the Presidio?

23 MS. ANDERSEN: I was the lead attorney for
24 the Presidio. Obviously we had two very excellent
25 Department of Justice attorneys, Brad O'Brien locally

1 here in San Francisco, and David Forsyth who's out of the
2 Natural Resources Division.

3 He recently moved to Denver, and Mike Lewis
4 from the Army. Some of you may remember him from days
5 gone by. He was representing the Army, because we also
6 filed a claim against the Army, and if we couldn't get
7 Caltrans to pay, we were going to turn to the Army. We
8 had backup.

9 MS. THOMAS: By Andrea deserves great
10 congratulations.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: I'm happy it turned out as
12 well as it had.

13 MS. THOMAS: Wonderful job.

14 MS. ANDERSEN: We'll get going forward.
15 The fat lady is warming up. We haven't had approval of
16 the court, but hopefully we'll be in a great situation
17 here.

18 And then we can clean up the lake and keep
19 the lake from getting polluted again in the future.

20 MR. BERMAN: One final question. In view
21 of the 1938 agreement, with the clarity of those phrases
22 that you read, why did Caltrans actually want to take
23 this to court?

24 They could have read those -- it seems to
25 me that it was a delay and a time-consuming thing and

1 they got fined half a million dollars to cover legal
2 costs.

3 So it seems to me that somebody was either
4 ill-advised or it was something that we don't really have
5 clear in mind or maybe -- maybe Caltrans from the
6 beginning, we thought the issue was that this had some
7 long-term consequences to Caltrans and it would affect
8 all kinds of things that Caltrans was doing, but that
9 concern is removed by this special agreement that exist
10 existed between the Army and the State of California.

11 So the logical reason for the intransigence
12 of Caltrans seems to be removed by this agreement. So
13 why did Caltrans dig its heels in and want to take this
14 to court?

15 MS. ANDERSEN: I don't know. I obviously
16 can't speak for them. You know the financial situation
17 in the State of California, you know.

18 Maybe they didn't feel like they could
19 settle without the judge telling them what they needed
20 to.

21 I don't know. I can't speak for them.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: I had a question about
23 collecting from the State of California. Is that a --

24 MS. ANDERSEN: Are you asking me are they
25 judgment proof? Are they going to be broke and can't pay

1 this debt?

2 I don't have any indications of that right
3 now.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's stipulated when checks
6 have to pay us by. They only have a certain amount of
7 time.

8 MS. ANDERSEN: Once the consent decree is
9 approved, they have a limited amount of time. It does
10 come in one lump sum.

11 MS. FANELLI: To Caltrans' defense and
12 having worked at big bureaucratic agencies, I think you
13 can recognize that it's not a winning -- a winning
14 strategy as a staffer at a big bureaucracy to go in and
15 say, "Oh, yeah. We're going to lose. Let me write you a
16 check."

17 You usually need some other type of third
18 party impetus, and I believe to a certain extent, that
19 was Caltrans' strategy.

20 They might have really truly recognized
21 they didn't have a good hand, and so they were the ones
22 that actually filed for summary judgment first --

23 MS. ANDERSEN: No. It was just according
24 to the court, the court schedule.

25 MS. FANELLI: But that's why they -- they

1 did participate, and I think actively engage with us.

2 Because once summary judgment, there's no
3 head to go after, right? It's coming from a third party.
4 This is the agreement, and so it made it a lot easier for
5 the staff people and for their attorney to sit down and
6 work, take that pressure off.

7 That's just my own opinion, but --

8 MS. SEGAL: The dollar amount, though,
9 that you negotiated between the parties, though. The
10 judge didn't have anything to do --

11 MS. ANDERSEN: No. The judge didn't have
12 anything to do with that. The judge determined
13 liability, and we got together to determine how we would
14 allocate damages.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: I would certainly like
16 to thank Andrea and Eileen and Terri, and I know Brian
17 and Bob and others were involved in this over the years.

18 I mean, this is one of the first things we
19 worked on back in 1994 was the Army saying, "Oh, it's all
20 clean. No further action."

21 So that you have taken it to this
22 conclusion is really quite laudable and remarkable and we
23 really thank you for your efforts.

24 MS. ANDERSEN: Sure.

25 MS. FANELLI: I want us to shut down the

1 screen here.

2 FACILITATOR KERN: And if we can actually
3 clean the thing up before 2014, that would have been only
4 twenty years to have it cleaned up, so --

5 MS. FANELLI: Well, it's the eighty/twenty
6 rule. Eighty years wringing our hands on what we're
7 trying to do and twenty years to get it done.

8 You can understand there is some schedule
9 pressure, and I do have to say that at this point,
10 Caltrans has been working extremely cooperatively with
11 us, and we're trying to get information out to you
12 because we are going to -- there's a lot of technical
13 elements to this program and they're not all simple.

14 You know, supporting Highway 1 and -- and
15 building supports on it while it's actively being used
16 and Doyle Drive is being constructed at the same time is
17 not a simple solution, and that's why we reported that
18 there's going to be night work and people can expect
19 that.

20 There's going to be lane closures, but we
21 know the time frame that we're trying to do this, two
22 years.

23 So I think we're hoping to get enough
24 information, understand the impact so that when we get
25 into this, everyone's on the same page. I know we're

1 supportive of the process that we know we have to go
2 through.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. I can imagine if
4 we have any kind of stabilization of that road with such
5 a busy road, you know, approach to the Golden Gate
6 Bridge, it's going to be a really big thing.

7 MS. FANELLI: So we have had two -- DTSC
8 has had two public information sessions that obviously
9 we're participating in. One in September, one in
10 November, and there is contemplation that we will likely
11 have another one before the FS/RAP is issued, and DTSC's
12 looking at late January for that, and I would think that
13 at that point, we'd be able to present a little bit more
14 information -- because we're working on the FS/RAP now --
15 about the elements of the remediation program.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: Is there anything else
17 that you would want to say about Mountain Lake and that
18 meeting that we can start talking about getting people to
19 the meeting?

20 MS. MAJHAIL: Yeah. Definitely get the
21 word out, and once we get -- we need to get information,
22 and once we have the information, then we'll plan in
23 detail and then we'll send out the invitations just like
24 we did earlier, as well.

25 If you have any, please send the

1 invitations out on your side, as well. If you know
2 people, talk to them about it, as well.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: You mentioned late
4 January, do you think? Do you have a tentative date that
5 you're thinking about?

6 MS. MAJHAIL: No.

7 MS. FANELLI: I don't know.

8 Jan, were you at the last one? Was it very
9 well attended?

10 MS. MONAGHAN: I thought to so.

11 MS. FANELLI: And so Caltrans participated
12 in it, as well. So it will be a similar type
13 presentation. We just would have a lot more information
14 about the remedy in particular.

15 When we did that, we sent out, I believe,
16 like 900 invitations to all the folks.

17 MS. MAJHAIL: To the mailing list, and we
18 designed the mailing list especially for the Mountain
19 Lake area around the area and it was mailed to everybody,
20 so --

21 MS. FANELLI: Right.

22 MS. MAJHAIL: And before we -- before we
23 start a public comment period.

24 MS. FANELLI: Remediation will not be
25 putting anything back in the water. Terri might -- she

1 has her preferences about what goes in the water, but it
2 would be a future project.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, I'd be interested
4 in talking to you more about the whole level and the east
5 arm restoration.

6 Well, we have a couple -- one item, at
7 least, left, the new business. Thanks very much again
8 for coming out to our meeting especially to talk to us
9 about this.

10 The PAH letter. I didn't know you were
11 going to be here tonight.

12 MS. TSUJI: Neither did I. I was on my
13 way back from Brisbane.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you so much for
15 coming to the meeting. Much appreciated.

16 MS. TSUJI: Plus there was an accident. I
17 wasn't going to get home any time soon.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Did you bring the
19 brownies, cookies?

20 MS. TSUJI: I would have if I was
21 planning, but it wasn't on my calendar to do it.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: Darn. Oh, well. But
23 what this agenda item is about keeping it in front of us.
24 We know there were discussions going on about PAHs and
25 cleanup level.

1 Are we at a point where we need to comment
2 to you directly about this or is it not on your radar
3 screen yet.

4 MS. TSUJI: Internally, as I said last
5 time, it's on the to-do list. But realize I'm coming off
6 of a two-week marathon hiring session. We're getting new
7 staff.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Terrific.

9 MS. TSUJI: So I've been ambushed as I
10 walk out of the interview room.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

12 MS. TSUJI: And our tox folks, we've been
13 kind of swamped. We probably won't get to it even until
14 the new year, and there's all this other work coming in.

15 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes.

16 MS. TSUJI: Actual project work. That
17 letter in and of itself may not get directly addressed if
18 it does come up in upcoming RAPs.

19 It may get addressed in that forum. It
20 really is just a matter of deciding because of workload
21 where resources are expended, and I know right now,
22 everyone wants to get the RAP in, reviewed and approved
23 so that cleanups can be implemented within the next two
24 years. It's a critical thing.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: Yeah. Well, we're

1 certainly interested in talking to you about the issues
2 around that cleanup level and the risk assessment and
3 things that would be adjusted to potentially relax the
4 cleanup level out there.

5 Because I think that could then become a --
6 then it would be a precedent for the whole Presidio, and
7 we've -- we really haven't had a chance to tune into some
8 of these issues like the -- the studies of industrial pH
9 deposition and things of that nature.

10 MS. TSUJI: What I can do, our
11 toxicologist that worked on the pH with the Northern
12 California background is what we call a retire returnee,
13 so she only works two days a week.

14 I can see if she would be willing to come
15 to an evening meeting. It's a little harder for me to
16 say I have to have you.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: Oh, sure.

18 MS. TSUJI: But I can --

19 FACILITATOR KERN: That would be --

20 MS. TSUJI: I can see, and then we can
21 have both toxicologists come to give a brief overview.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: That would be terrific,
23 and then we could -- if that could happen, then we could
24 get this letter together and have it as a way of
25 communicating some ideas.

1 MS. TSUJI: I will need to check with them
2 to see if they're available.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay. Perfect. Thank
4 you.

5 And I just checking in with everybody.
6 Everybody's aware of what this issue with pH's? Okay.
7 And if you're not and you want to talk to me offline, we
8 can.

9 Are there any -- I just want to thank the
10 Trust for their presentations tonight. This is really
11 such great news about Mountain Lake, such a hopeful step
12 to think back to all the resolutions and all the meetings
13 and, you know, everything we've done and to see this
14 result, it's really remarkable.

15 Is there any public comment? Bob, would
16 you like to talk for like ten minutes?

17 MR. BOGGS: No. I appreciated the
18 meeting. Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: Very good. Thanks for
20 being here.

21 Action items and agenda items coming up.
22 I'm going to encourage people to go out to these sites,
23 landfill E, fillsite 1, landfill 2, check them out and
24 see what they are.

25 Maybe we can put together our own photo

1 slide show and see what -- show it to people.

2 I noted in your presentation that 228 area
3 was going to be shut off maybe in a few weeks? So we'll
4 be looking to hear all the results of the -- those levels
5 coming down --

6 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: -- to the target.

8 Yeah. The sand for the 207/231 being
9 stored, I'm really -- that's such -- another great thing
10 to come into that good clean sand. That's great.

11 And I'm really pleased that that result of
12 beach sampling, it's something that came up at a meeting
13 for Mountain Lake. That's a great result.

14 So I think that we just want to carry
15 forward into the future, you know, keep close tabs on
16 Mountain Lake and the pH issues, and then there are a lot
17 of these RIs coming out. I note the Battery Howe Wagner,
18 fillsite 6B RI is coming out, Baker Beach 2.

19 So we'll be looking for those.

20 Are there any comments for the good of the
21 order? Yes.

22 MS. SEGAL: We did talk about in the past
23 meetings -- we didn't mention the new budget of 165
24 million dollars.

25 Is there any kind of heartburn about where

1 that additional money is going to come from? We didn't
2 talk about that.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: Well, presumably it's
4 within the insurance coverage range. I think that's --

5 MS. FANELLI: That is -- that is the
6 presumption, yes.

7 MS. SEGAL: Okay.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: If that number were to
9 start peaking over 200 million, then I think we'd have
10 something to --

11 MS. SEGAL: That's more than the original
12 99.

13 MS. FANELLI: That number includes --
14 that's not the real liability to Zurich. Zurich's
15 liability is less than that.

16 MR. BERMAN: Zurich is now aware of the
17 formidable legal power that resides in the Presidio and
18 is probably shaking in their boots.

19 MS. FANELLI: I couldn't agree with you
20 more, Sam. We've scared them. Andrea has shown them her
21 teeth.

22 MS. SEGAL: All right. I just wanted to
23 know that.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Now what it's really
25 coming down to is getting the sites cleaned up and start

1 billing Zurich. That's the impression that I'm getting.

2 MS. FANELLI: The real challenge we
3 honestly have is two and a half years, and we have
4 some -- we've made remarkable progress, and my staff
5 needs to be applauded for being able to do 1 and 2 and E
6 in the time frame that we have done it.

7 But we have Mountain Lake 1 and 2 and a
8 bunch of legal dribs and drabs all over the place to wrap
9 up, and we are moving very quickly and we are trying to
10 disclose and be open and transparent with what we're
11 doing.

12 So what we need is sort of support, good
13 questions, clarifying questions, things that we can
14 timely act on and help make sure everybody's informed so
15 that things go as smoothly as possible.

16 So if I can request those types of things,
17 issues or clarifications, let's get them out because we
18 really only have a small window of time to complete this
19 work.

20 MS. SEGAL: Little hiccups like 937.

21 MS. FANELLI: Those are nothing. Those
22 are nothing for the public. Those are things that we
23 deal with from construction. They're small things.

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Then the -- one area
25 that is the unknown area are the sites that have been in

1 the unknown sites or the sort of large list that has
2 been --

3 MS. FANELLI: They are on a different
4 schedule.

5 FACILITATOR KERN: Right.

6 MS. FANELLI: Their schedule right now is
7 for us to take a look at them to the extent that they are
8 a site, is there data that indicates that there's a
9 condition or a substance that requires regulatory action.

10 We're looking at doing that assessment and
11 having it completed in the 2013 time frame.

12 The reason being is that insurance policy
13 is a claims made basis. We do not have to have the work
14 actually done by May 2014.

15 MS. ANDERSEN: For the unknown sites.

16 MS. FANELLI: For the unknown sites, but
17 we do need to have a claim that documents the substance
18 or condition. So we have a certain threshold that we
19 have to reach, but it's a little bit different.

20 FACILITATOR KERN: There is that Baker
21 Beach slag site.

22 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

23 FACILITATOR KERN: That just popped into
24 my mind, but we'll save that all for the new year as an
25 agenda item to check in on -- on those sites.

1 MR. BERMAN: In the past, Mark had put
2 together a document that listed a whole bunch of sites
3 that were not --

4 FACILITATOR KERN: That's exactly what I'm
5 talking about.

6 MR. BERMAN: So you're referring to that.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: As a way for my own
8 personal way of ending this meeting and this year, I do
9 want to thank our agency colleagues for all the work that
10 they've put in all this year, attending our meetings, and
11 particularly the progress we made at fillsite 1, landfill
12 2, getting all that contamination removed.

13 Landfill E, I'm appreciative that that site
14 is now complete and looking forward to the eventually
15 reuse there.

16 So we are very appreciative of the work
17 going on and we're appreciative that you're hearing our
18 questions and incorporating them where you can. So thank
19 you.

20 Are there any other comments for the good
21 of the order?

22 MS. FANELLI: How about happy holidays to
23 everybody?

24 FACILITATOR KERN: Happy holidays.
25 There's probably a little cake and some eggnog in the

1 back, and then without objection, this part of the
2 meeting is adjourned.

3 (The meeting concluded at 8:55 PM).

4 ---o0o---

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the time
5 and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a full, true and
6 complete record of said matter.

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for
8 either or any of the parties in the foregoing meeting and caption
9 named, or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in
10 said action.

11

12

13

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have

14

hereunto set my hand this

15

7th day of February,
2012.

16

17

18

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25